DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 147 975 95 EA 010 173

AUTHOR Moon, Rexford G., Jr.
TITLE National Planning for Education.
INSTITUTION Academy for Educational Development, Inc., New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
PUB DATE Jun 70
CONTRACT OEC-0-8-980797-4634(010)
NOTE 164p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$8.69 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Change Strategies; Educational Change; *Educational Planning; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; Government Role; Higher Education

ABSTRACT

This report presents the findings of a study on the current status of planning in American higher education and the feasibility of establishing a "national planning congress" for higher education. The study team gathered the views of key people concerned with higher education planning through extensive interviews and seminars throughout the country with college presidents and chief planning officers, federal and state government officials, association representatives, members of the research community, economists, and other key people in education and government. Based on this study, the team recommends against the establishment of a national planning congress for higher education and argues instead for the passage of an "education act of 1970" designed to improve institutional and statewide planning for education at all levels and to improve the coordination of federal educational support programs. Part 1 of the report describes the purpose of the study and presents its findings and recommendations. Part 2 discusses the rationale for improved educational planning, educational planning as a process, and possible ways to improve educational planning in the U.S. (JG)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED147975

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

NATIONAL PLANNING FOR EDUCATION

Rexford G. Moon, Jr.
Project Director

Prepared by
U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education
Bureau of Research
Under Congract No. OEC-0-8-980797-4634(010)

EA 010 173

Academy for Educational Development, Inc.
437 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10022

June 1970

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

The contents of this report are in the public domain and may be freely used without permission.

The Academy for Educational Development is a nonprofit, tax-exempt corporation serving schools, colleges, universities, government agencies, foundations, and other public and private organizations concerned with education or desiring to develop educational plans for the future. The Academy offices are as follows:

New York
437 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10022

(212) 758-5454

Washington, D. C.
1424 Sixteenth Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

(202) 265-5576

Denver
820 Sixteenth Street
Denver, Colorado 80202

(303) 244-9258

ACADEMY FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, INC.

Board of Directors

SAMUEL M. BROWNELL (Chairman)
Professor of Urban Educational Administration, Yale University Graduate School; formerly U.S. Commissioner of Education; Superintendent of Schools, Detroit.

ALVIN C. EURICH
President, Academy for Educational Development; Chairman, Educational Research and Development Division, FAS International, Inc.; Chairman of the Board, Academy of Religion and Mental Health.

SIDNEY G. TICKTON
Executive Vice President and Treasurer, Academy for Educational Development.

JOSEPH S. ISEMAN (Secretary)
Partner, Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton, and Garrison.

ROBERT O. ANDERSON
Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer, AtlanticRichfieldCompany.

FAIRFAX M. CONE
Chairman, Board of Trustees, University of Chicago; Founder and Director, Foote, Cone & Belding.

GILBERT GRANET
President, FAS International, Inc.

ROBERT B. HANSBERGER
President, Boise Cascade Corporation.

THEODORE W. KHEEL
Partner, Battle, Fowler, Stokes, and Kheel.

THEODORE LEVITT
Professor of Business Administration, Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration.

LOUIS B. LUNDBORG
Chairman of the Board, Bank of America.

FRED LUDEKENS
Chairman of the Board, FAS International, Inc.

HERBERT R. MAYES
Director and Consultant, McCall Corporation; Director, Saturday Review; Formerly President, McCall Corporation.

JAMES A. McCAIN
President, Kansas State University.

NEWTON N. MINOW
Senior Partner, Leibman, Williams, Bennett, Baird and Minow.

JAMES O'BRIEN
Vice President and Director, Standard Oil Company of California.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Letter of Transmittal..

SUMMARY.. i

PART I.

1. THE ASSIGNMENT.................................... I-1
2. FINDINGS: PRESENT STATUS OF PLANNING FOR HIGHER EDUCATION.. I-5
3. FINDINGS: PROSPECTS FOR NATIONAL PLANNING................ I-15
4. RECOMMENDATION.................................... I-20

PART II.

1. RATIONALE... II-1
2. PLANNING AS PROCESS............................... II-3
3. REQUISITE STEPS TO MEET THE CURRENT CRISIS IN EDUCATIONAL PLANNING.......................... II-9
4. HOW CAN NATIONAL PLANNING HELP?................ II-26
5. EDUCATION AND THE NATIONAL INTEREST: A PROPOSAL FOR AN EDUCATION ACT OF 1970........... II-30
6. CONCLUSION.. II-39

APPENDICES

A. Evolving Conceptions of the Federal Role in Education, as Analyzed in Major Reports on Education, 1929-1969....... A-1
B. Summary of Status of Current Planning and Coordination for Higher Education in the 50 States....................... B-1
C. Study Methodology................................. C-1
D. Index of Exhibits and Supplementary Materials (on file in Academy offices)...................................... D-1
E. Study Consultants and Staff........................ E-1

ACADEMY FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, INC.
437 MADISON AVENUE
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10022
(212) 758-5454

December 31, 1969

Dr. James E. Allen, Jr.
Assistant Secretary of Health,
Education and Welfare
330 Independence Avenue, S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20201

Dear Dr. Allen:

We are pleased to submit the report of the Academy for Educational Development on the feasibility of establishing a national planning congress for higher education. This report on the status of planning in higher education contains our recommendations for guiding its future growth. It was completed as Phase I of a four-phase project in accordance with Contract No. OEC -0-8-980797-4634 (010).

Throughout the country, the need for education to look ahead has never been greater. We have found, however, that the present planning capabilities of institutions and of state and federal governments are inadequate to safeguard the future well-being of higher education, and its response to the changing needs of individuals and society. We were struck with the sense of inadequacy and frustration that pervades planners and administrators as they try to cope with rising costs, mushrooming enrollment, dissension, and exigent new demands. Ironically, proliferating government support programs designed to ameliorate the situation often aggravate it.

Extensive interviews and seminars held all around the country brought us the views and experience of key people concerned with planning for higher education: college presidents and chief planning officers, federal and state government officials, association representatives, members of the research community, economists, and other key people in education and government. (Our study of each state's procedures for higher-education planning, summarized in an appendix to this report, will be published separately in full under the title, "A State by State Summary of Higher-Education Planning.")

For the first time on a national scale, college and university administrators facing similar problems every day had the chance to get together and talk about what must be done to improve planning. The resounding impression the Academy drew from these men and women was the immediate need for vigorous action to improve planning. Clearly the only effective response is changed and improved planning that will aid education broadly at all levels.

This report rejects, therefore, the possibility of establishing a national planning congress. However, the report does go on to propose an Education Act of 1970, of the scope we believe is necessary to make a substantial impact on the educational planning process, not only for higher education, but for elementary and secondary education, too.

Sincerely,

Alvin C Eurich

Alvin C. Eurich
President

SUMMARY

In this report the Academy for Educational Development offers two major recommendations on how to improve planning for higher education throughout the nation, one negative and one positive. The negative recommendation -- against the establishment of a national planning congress to guide the growth of higher education -- is a direct response to the Academy's original assignment from the U. S. Office of Education.

The positive recommendation -- an outgrowth of the study's negative findings -- proposes an Education Act of 1970 designed to improve institutional and statewide planning for education at all levels, to strengthen the federal government's capacity to coordinate its own educational support programs, and to establish education more clearly as a major national concern.

The provisions of the proposed act are as follows:

1. A declaration of policy by the U. S. Congress which explicitly states the federal government's responsibility for extending and improving educational opportunity.
2. An annual Education Report by the President to the Congress, setting forth:

- The extent of educational opportunities in the United States, their quality, and the improvements needed to carry out national policy.
- Current and foreseeable trends in education.
- A review and assessment of federal education programs during the preceding year.
- A program for carrying out policy more effectively, plus recommendations for appropriate legislation.

3. A Department of Education, headed by a Secretary of Cabinet rank with the specifically designated responsibility of coordinating all federal programs in support of education.

4. A Council of Educational Advisers, reporting to the Secretary of Education, and charged with helping him to evaluate educational trends, appraise federal programs, and formulate others in line with national policy.

5. A Joint Committee of the Congress on Education, composed of the senior members of the Senate and House Committees concerned with education, and charged with:

- Receiving and studying the President's annual Education Report.
- Submitting each year its own findings and its recommendations on the main points of the President's report.
- Conducting studies on important educational issues.

6. Funds to strengthen state agencies in carrying out comprehensive planning for education at all levels.

7. Funds to establish programs to train educational planners; and to establish a National Institute for Educational Management that would investigate, develop, and apply improved planning and management techniques for education.

This report exceeds the limits of the study originally called for by the U. S. Office of Education, not only by including elementary and secondary education, but by suggesting changes in the federal system of educational support that go beyond "planning" as narrowly construed. Only through such thorough-going changes can the federal government, the states, and individual institutions meet the critical need for better educational planning.

Academy investigations for this study documented the present crisis in higher-education planning, which the recent precipitous rise in college enrollment brought to a head, but which is the outcome, essentially, of our patchwork methods of educational support. The prime cause is neither the dearth of trained educational planners, nor prevailing confusion as to what planning really means or can accomplish, but the inability of all those concerned with and responsible for education in this country to work together effectively. This failure stands out most clearly in present methods and procedures for planning, but in fact it underlies all major educational problems today.

In the Academy's judgment, the proposed Education Act of 1970 will help the President, his education officials, the Congress, the states and the institutions -- individually and cooperatively -- to fulfill their particular constitutional and historical responsibilities. Their smooth working relationship will, in the long run, constitute the most effective national planning for education.

PART I

1. THE ASSIGNMENT

By 1975 nine or ten million students will be seeking college and university education. In order to be able to accept these students and to provide them with the types of educational programs they need, higher education institutions will require no less than $40 billion in operating and capital expenses then, compared to $20 billion now. Where will the money come from? How will it be apportioned among the many needs? What planning is being done today to assure that higher education will be ready to meetthe needs in 1975, 1980, and in subsequent years?

The Academy for Educational Development, at the request of the U. S. Office of Education, set out to determine -- not the answers to the above listed questions -- but the capability of leaders in higher education institutions and government agencies to answer them. Specifically, we were asked to determine the feasibility of "establishing a national planning congress which would develop coherent, articulate, and comprehensive national policies and strategies which could guide the growth of higher education so that it might more effectively and more relevantly meet the needs of the nation in years to come." In order to meet the terms of the contract the Academy considered various aspects of a national planning congress, particularly what it could do, and how whatever it might do could be done. As the study developed, other broader alternatives were proposed and considered.

To begin with, the Academy found it necessary to determine the status of planning for higher education and the extent to which planning efforts were being coordinated at the national level. In determining this status, the Academy:

- Conducted 70 seminars in 27 cities with presidents and other high level administrators of two and four year colleges, both private and public -- the men and women who are (or should be) directly involved in higher-education planning.
- Met with representatives of state higher education coordinating agencies, higher education associations, and other key people concerned with the future of higher education.
- Interviewed members of federal and state agencies and national research organizations that support higher education.
- Evaluated a number of proposals by government and private organizations relating to increased coordination

and planning for higher education.

- Requested planning documents from every accredited college and university in the country.

- Surveyed every state's planning procedure as it related to higher education, both public and private, including such matters as coordination and governance, facilities construction, student aid programs, vocational-technical programs, and medical education.

This work produced a unique collection from all over the country of institutional, state, and federal plans, reports on the attitudes towards planning of higher education and government leaders, and their views as to the preeminent needs in any national planning effort. As a result of analyzing these materials, and on the basis of its own experience, the Academy evaluates in this report the present status of planning in higher education, and suggests what must be done to improve it -- in institutions, states, and within the federal government.

Among the questions the Academy considered were the following:

- What characterizes the most effective planning efforts?

- Who is responsible for planning within institutions and government agencies? What do they need to know to plan well?
- What kinds of resources -- current data, comparative information, research results -- are available to planners?
- How do institutions and governments use plans? Do plans significantly influence future policy?
- What are the major national educational issues with which planners must concern themselves?
- What are the stumbling blocks to better planning at all levels? To what extent can federal action remove or minimize them?

2. FINDINGS: PRESENT STATUS OF PLANNING FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Colleges and universities, state and federal agencies, regional groups, and private organizations make a great many plans for higher education. However, these efforts are by and large inadequate. For one thing, these groups and institutions exert small influence on the course of events that will most affect their future. Another reason is the paucity of skilled planners -- planners who understand modern techniques: e.g., the correlation between educational "inputs" and "outputs," methods to translate these factors into dollars and cents, procedures for projecting needs and costs into the future.

Furthermore, skilled practitioners of planning seldom play an integral part in the policy-and decision-making process of colleges and universities -- some because their chief interest is research, others because their responsibilities within an institution or agency are strictly financial. In addition, all planners need extensive information to plan well, statistical data as well as the results of research. Inadequate information is a serious problem.

Finally, confusion prevails in all quarters over what planning really means. Educators tend to confuse it with "control," and many feel that more effective planning, especially state and national planning, will threaten institutional freedom and educational diversity.

Academy investigations into the status of planning in various sectors of higher education reveal the following:

Within states:

A. The most effective planning for higher education is being carried out by some state coordinating agencies. The best of them are mandated by state legislatures to take a comprehensive statewide view of higher education. They have the authority to draw public institutions of higher education together for planning purposes, and settle disputes between them. State coordinating agencies often serve the additional function, vital to good planning, of mediating between educational and political interests, helping to explain one side to the other.

B. Although some of these coordinating bodies have extensive planning staffs available to work with institutions and develop statewide plans, insufficient operating funds forces many such bodies to depend on the work of outside agencies. State legislatures vote funds more willingly for special projects than for continuing support. This practice prevents the development of a permanent planning staff, and can cost more in the long run.

C. A major failing of state coordinating agencies for higher education is their exclusion of private higher education. Many have been stymied by the church-state issue, although a growing number have begun to invite representatives of private colleges and universities to sit in, at least, on state planning activities.

D. The proliferation of state agencies (some federally mandated) supporting various aspects of higher education -- student aid, vocational-technical programs, community colleges -- tends to weaken the effectiveness of primary coordinating agencies insofar as it divides authority and responsibility among many groups, thus inhibiting comprehensive statewide planning.

E. As the day approaches when some kind of post-secondary education will be available to all who seek it, it becomes increasingly necessary to relate higher education more closely to developments in elementary and secondary education, and to programs of adult and continuing education. The majority of state coordinating agencies have no such broad authority. Thus one finds overlapping responsibilities and confused planning in such areas as two-year colleges, vocational-technical education, and special programs for ill-prepared high school graduates seeking higher education.

Within institutions of higher education:

A. The planning efforts of colleges and universities are very uneven, ranging from nothing at all to volumes of data and projections supporting comprehensive master plans.

B. The sine qua non of good planning is a president who understands what it is all about. Such presidents direct small private colleges as well as large public universities. In general, however, the Academy found the most comprehensive planning in large public universities. Their sheer size and rate of growth have forced them into the kind of planning small colleges seldom undertake. Because of the strength and influence of the big public institutions, they can make and carry out their plans with less frustration than weaker institutions encounter in state government councils.

C. At best, however, the Academy found university plans seldom documented as to cost or sources of funds. Nor do they present, in most cases, alternative plans of action to achieve the expansion that is invariably called for. The assumption prevails that growth is so imminent and imperative as to obviate extensive documentation, especially in graduate and professional schools.

D. The Academy believes a basic cause for inadequate planning in colleges and universities is their vulnerability to outside forces on which they wield no influence, but which strongly influence them. These forces include state and federal support, on which institutions of higher education are increasingly dependent; and pressures from faculty, students, and the community at large which in many cases exceed traditional responsibilities of the institution and its ability to respond.

E. State colleges, since they are often controlled from the state capitol, tend to regard planning as an instrument of external control. Planning for state colleges is best in those states that assign it to a coordinating agency that includes institutional representatives in the planning process. In states delegating this responsibility to a state budget office or legislative council, plans are less successful, and state colleges often resent them as restrictive and unresponsive.

F. Community colleges, rapidly growing in response to present needs, have in many cases evolved imaginative and far-reaching plans, if only because they have no tradition or precedent to fall back on. On the other hand, their future is intricately bound up with political and social (especially local) developments. The Academy believes that the next major step should be to relate community-college planning more closely to other sectors of higher education and to secondary education.

G. The greatest range of quality manifests itself in the planning efforts of private colleges and universities. Relatively few of these institutions have the funds, staff, and confidence to chart their own courses. The majority of private institutions make no extensive plans simply because of a bleak uncertainty that they can survive long enough to make planning worthwhile. What is needed, they feel, if America wants to preserve the diversity and pluralism provided by private higher education, are flexible new forms of public support.

Within private organizations and regional higher-education associations:

A. Organizations such as the Western Interstate Council on Higher Education, which focus on regional planning for higher education, deal with crucial problems basic to good planning, and disseminate their findings among administrators and government and institutional planners. Their work has the added advantage of drawing together college and university officials in the region to work on common problems.

B. The Education Commission of the States acts as a private or regional group in that it is without prescribed administrative responsibilities. On the other hand, each member state wishing to join must first obtain legislative or executive approval. Thus the Commission offers a unique structure -- national but not "federal," with features of a detached research group as well as of a public body -- that could help to pull together elements for better national planning for higher education. The Commission could begin by acting as a center for information exchange, and a forum where planners and administrators could compare notes, and help each other with common problems.

C. Private foundations and research organizations in recent years have recognized the need for a comprehensive approach to planning for higher education, and have generated broadly based research that can be of significant help in the future. The work of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education is a good example. But by their very nature, private groups are not charged with maintaining the general public welfare, nor can they expect to directly shape legislation. As a result, such private research in educational planning has tended to justify and guide educational developments growing out of political decisions rather than to influence those decisions.

Within the federal government:

A. Despite the widespread assumption that the federal government engages in a great deal of planning, Academy investigations turned up few federal comprehensive planning documents with real influence on policy or operations. Agency budgets and prepared testimony bearing on proposed legislation contain elements of planning, but their scope is limited to the agency in question; budgets provide detailed projections only for the next fiscal year. Since planning and operations are often assigned to different offices with a department or agency, it is difficult to mesh these functions effectively.

B. The federal government has no satisfactory means to coordinate the forty-plus separate agencies sponsoring programs in support of education -- among others, the Department of Defense, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the National Science Foundation, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Public Health Service. Although each group's plans may be well-conceived, they are insufficiently integrated within the total federal effort. On paper, the Federal Interagency Committee on Education would appear to fulfill a coordinating function, but in practice it lacks the authority conferred by full Executive support. As a result, these agencies often plan at cross purposes.

C. The Academy finds that the lack of planners, and of administrators who understand planning, adversely affects federal as well as state education agencies and individual institutions. The prime reason may be that fluctuating levels of public support for government programs favor administrators who can respond quickly to changing circumstances, rather than those with the long-range vision that characterizes good planners.

D. The lack of a federal policy on education continues as a major impediment to better planning within the federal government, and by extension, within every segment of education receiving federal support. While federal responsibility for the well-being of our schools and colleges (and students) seems to underly the legislation that supports education, a federal policy is nowhere explicitly stated, nor fully agreed upon.

E. The federal government collects voluminous information from colleges and universities, and from the states, but it is too fragmentary, out-of-date, and undigested to be of much use to administrators working on day-to-day problems of institutional management, or to federal education officials.

F. The Bureau of the Budget, because of its control of the purse-strings, emerges as a powerful force in the federal planning process. Although the Bureau is not a planning agency, the internal papers prepared by its staff serve, in the absence of effective agency plans, as strong guides to agency programs and operations.

G. The investigations of the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress into national economic concerns (including the economics of education) exemplify the kind of national, publicly-supported research activity needed to shed light on all educational issues.

H. The use of the Program Planning Budgeting System (PPBS) within federal agencies has met with mixed success. Key government officials reported to the Academy that although cost-benefit studies help fiscal planning, PPBS will require further adaptation to the needs of education to be fully constructive. Congress has rejected the use of the PPBS format by the U. S. Office of Education when presenting programs for congressional review, apparently in the belief that it does not accurately represent what really happens in Office of Education programs. In the end, PPBS can succeed only if it is integrally related to all operations and planning, and carried out by those who understand it.

I. Recent reorganizations within the Office of Education will help to raise planning to a position of greater influence on internal policy and programs. Until now planning within the Office of Education has suffered from the same problems -- poor inter-bureau communications, distance from decision-makers, and first-line loyalty to its clients (i. e., the schools) -- that beset the planning efforts of other agencies.

3. FINDINGS: PROSPECTS FOR NATIONAL PLANNING

Proponents of more and better public planning for education realize that many people still regard it with suspicion, as at best a necessary but risky expedient to achieve desired ends. Americans tend to mistrust centralized government authority particularly when it impinges on something as personal as their children's education. Some people still regard any kind of planning as a threat to individual freedom, whether it be the freedom to develop innovations, or the freedom to maintain the status quo. These attitudes constitute, in the Academy's opinion, a root cause for the reluctance in many quarters to embrace the concept of educational planning at a national level.

Although planning is now accepted in business, industry, defense, and in the conduct of certain health and economic policies, there is a widespread belief that the diversity of American educational processes would be stifled by more planning. The fact that in many cases such high-sounding phrases as "educational diversity" and "intellectual freedom" are used to mask strong personal or institutional desires to maintain present positions of power serves to explain both the depth of such fears and their frequent irrationality.

On the other hand, there is a growing recognition that in a complex modern society individual initiative alone will not guarantee success. Not only in education, but in such fields as health and environmental development, the evidence indicates that future success will require more -- not less -- good planning.

The successful landing of a man on the moon was possible only through long-term, thorough planning. This costly and technologically complex achievement required a new partnership to be forged between universities, the federal government and private industry. The task required new kinds of organization, fresh knowledge, new tools, higher levels of job performance, and the close-knit cooperation of hundreds of thousands of people in private industry, the military, and the government. United behind a clear goal, they worked together magnificently to achieve it.

If Americans can thus collaborate in conquering the uncharted realms of space, why can we not work more closely together in achieving educational goals? What are the stumbling blocks to this kind of comprehensive planning for the education of our children?

In the first place, we have yet to agree on a goal or goals for education as clear-cut or compelling as putting an American on the moon. We must plan toward such a goal, but the world of education is far too diffused and diversified for goals to be easily arrived at. Furthermore, in the space effort, we were moving into entirely new territory and the problems were largely technical. Education involves people and a tangled web of structures and relationships built up over the past 300 years.

Much of today's student unrest -- and our failure to deal adequately with it -- reflects the complexity of the problem. Student unrest is the smoke from many different fires. The issues are ideological, racial, and institutional. Students are demanding, in effect, a realignment of national priorities.

Although colleges and universities (and, increasingly, high schools) bear the brunt of student dissatisfaction, they are powerless to respond to many of these demands, because, acting individually, they cannot deal effectively with the complex issues involved. Individual planning efforts, however appropriate within the framework of the institution that conceived them, are ineffective in the broader social context. Thus some planning officers, recognizing their inability to make basic assumptions with any degree of certainty, retreat to the narrower aspects of planning over which they do feel some control -- student enrollment projections based on current programs, square footage, etc.

Although students decry educational irrelevance, it may in fact be argued that their education is irrelevant not to commonly accepted (but often unexamined) educational goals, but rather to the values and goals that students hold important. To the student, the college offers the most immediate and vulnerable target upon which to vent his dissatisfaction with the larger society. But the college, even when it would like to reorder its priorities, even when it sympathizes with its student dissidents, cannot achieve real change unless new priorities are made explicit at the national level, and until the institutions and government come to more realistic terms in working out their ever closer relationship.

In addition to students, other groups in education are becoming increasingly vocal in expressing their views. Although they were at one time looked on as forums for the advancement of education generally, they are sharpening their purposes and defining their constituencies.

Teachers' unions, for instance, having successfully pressed for higher teacher salaries, now are a major power in education. At the same time, they have lost the image of an essentially "benevolent" group supported by all those interested in educational improvement. In much the same way, higher-education associations no longer speak for the "general good of education." The expansion of higher education has required them to clarify their purposes. In order to serve any effective function in promoting national educational welfare, it has become increasingly necessary for them to speak exclusively for their particular membership.

The more viewpoints to be considered in making plans for education, the harder it is to move ahead under present arrangements. In this sense, the increased power of teachers' unions or student groups, for example, is an obstacle to educational planning as it is presently conducted, as are other outside influences. The solution is not to dilute the influence of these groups, which legitimately represent important interests (as do regents, trustees, legislators, taxpayers' organizations, parents, and professional organizations) but to find effective means to involve them in cooperative planning for all of education.

4. RECOMMENDATION

On the basis of its findings for this study and its experience in education, the Academy recommends against the establishment of a national planning congress, as originally proposed, at this time.

At the time this project was undertaken, the Bureau of Research of the U.S. Office of Education expected that after a year of exploration and status evaluation the Academy would suggest the appointment of a 100-member national planning congress to:

- develop, over a two-year period, strategies (based on research and investigation carried out by a staff) for achieving goals and directions that would more effectively meet national needs in higher education.
- create smaller regional congresses to provide proper representation of the various segments of higher education in the national body.

The idea for convening a national group is not new. The last two decades have produced a number of suggestions, varying in scope, for the creation of bodies to carry out studies and to make recommendations for improving different levels of our educational system. The Commission on the

Financing of Higher Education in the early 1950's had many of the attributes of the planning congress posited at the beginning of this project. Certain Presidential task forces have had similar characteristics. In the past, various independent committees, some broadly based and others quite specialized, have dealt with an array of policy issues. The degree to which such independent groups influenced change in educational substance or structure varied considerably.

The Office of Education originally felt that a new congress specifically devoted to national planning could, without duplicating the efforts of these precursors, significantly broaden the information base on which effective planning depends and develop position papers to guide future action. As the Academy investigations proceeded, however, and contact was established with an extensive number of institutions, agencies, and organizations both in and out of the government, it became increasingly clear that more than a congress was needed for developing coherent, and comprehensive national policies and strategies to guide the growth of higher education in the years to come.

The prime difficulty that a national planning congress would face is the lack of "community" among colleges and universities. The effectiveness of the sort of congress originally proposed would largely depend on the extent of trust and cooperation it commanded among institutions of higher education. Academy investigations raised doubts that the essential community of interests, in a practical sense, actually exists. Although institutions of higher education share many concerns, inter-institutional cooperation as a day-to-day, working arrangement is still rudimentary. Competition for funds and status among institutions poses a fundamental obstacle to a national planning congress. The Academy discerned a pervasive feeling that, within the context of a national planning congress, each kind of institution (if not each individual institution) would be placing itself at a disadvantage.

In a different area, Academy findings led to the conclusion that a duplication of effort, on more than one level, was inevitable. The Carnegie Commission, for instance, is already well staffed, more than adequately supported by funds, and draws for its research, ideas, and projects upon many of the same sources available to a national planning congress. Efforts of federally staffed agencies engaged in planning would also be duplicated to some extent. But there would be an even more serious kind of duplication at another, more conceptual, level.

The national planning congress as originally projected, while it would be supported by federal funds, would be limited in its influence on national policies by the same problems within the federal structure that prompted the enquiry into the feasibility of such a congress in the first place.

Furthermore, whatever influence the congress might exert on policies for higher education would tend to create a counter-demand for congresses or commissions that might speak to the federal government for other levels of education and other points of view. Indeed, a number of groups are already advocating new directions for all levels of education. No new group, such as the proposed congress, can expect significantly greater success in effecting change, unless the impact of its recommendations is reinforced by more basic changes in federal educational policy.

The influence of the Carnegie Commission, for instance, is circumscribed by its private status. It has great prestige, to be sure, but its influence depends largely upon that prestige; it has no public mandate. By comparison, the proposed national planning congress would have two strikes against it. Lacking, on the one hand, the Carnegie Commission's freedom of action, it would gain, on the other hand, only minor leverage from its public status, having federal connections at a relatively low governmental level and a very limited mandate.

In recommending against a national planning congress at this time, the Academy also disputes the notion that the way to better planning lies in any "one-shot" approach. It would agree, however, that the federal government's strategy of appointing ad hoc groups to explore and analyze educational problems has been, to the extent of their mandates, successful. Composed of blue-ribbon members, these groups -- task forces, commissions, conferences -- have helped to focus national attention on critical educational issues, and have provided opportunities for educational leaders to work together on national problems.

Increasingly, however, the major educational problems today -- especially those which require comprehensive planning -- do not lend themselves to this approach. Underlying many of these problems, in fact, is the lack of a permanent integrated capability within the public structure of educational support that can develop and put into effect the ideas that these ad hoc groups initiate.

Ad hoc groups cannot really be effective unless their efforts can be more integrally related to governmental structure and processes. Only in a lengthy series of steps does the recommendation of an ad hoc group become law. After gaining support in an executive agency, it must make its way to a congressional committee, become incorporated into legislation, and receive first authorization and then appropriations sufficient to carry it out. Subsequent legislation, as well as the vagaries of annual appropriating procedures, will further affect the program's future. What is required to make the work of ad hoc groups effective is some way to tie educational needs in more closely with the governmental processes which must deal with them, and to instill greater responsibility and responsiveness in these processes.

In rejecting the establishment of a national planning congress, however, the Academy in no way disputes the need for national planning. On the contrary, the Academy believes that better national planning is critically needed today and that planning efforts throughout the country must be related to one another and to stated national policy. National educational planning can be effective only as part of a strong new role for education within the federal structure that will ensure top-level, high-priority attention by both the executive and legislative branches of government.

PART II

1. RATIONALE

If a national planning congress on higher education would fall far short of meeting America's urgent needs for cohesive planning for education, what then is required? The Academy for Educational Development found that its recent investigations sharpened impressions formed by many years of study and experience in education. And although a congress established at this time would, it appears, fail to accomplish its purpose, there emerges more strongly than ever the urgent need to set education on a strong new course. Planning is central to this objective.

The Academy feels obliged, therefore, to go beyond the limits of the original mandate, and offer the positive by-products of a negative finding. For the recommendation against a national congress was largely determined by the conviction, emerging from recent investigations, that the obstacles to improved national planning for education are too great to be surmounted by such a congress. What is required are major changes in the patchwork arrangements that now constitute educational planning. These changes must encompass all of education, from institutional planning at the grassroots to the very structure of the federal role in education and educational planning.

The need for improved planning cannot start nor stop with higher education; the lack of good planning affects all levels of education, from preschooling to graduate and professional education. The flaws in present procedures manifest themselves in every aspect of the problem investigated, large or small, local or national, theoretical or pragmatic. At one extreme could be cited such a simple and, one might think, easily remediable flaw as the lack of standardized forms for institutions to use in compiling information, working out plans, or requesting funds. At the other extreme is the lack of consensus on what "national planning" means, or should mean, as applied to education -- a lack by no means as abstract and tangential as it may sound. A middle-of-the-spectrum example is the paucity of trained educational planners and of effective programs for developing them.

What follows, then, are the positive convictions that grew out of the negative results of the study summarized in Part I of this report.

2. PLANNING AS PROCESS

Though this report exceeds the limits of the original study as commissioned, it does not venture into the perilous terrain of specific educational goals. It simply accepts, as a *given*, the nation's commitment to the broad purpose of providing educational opportunities of high quality for everyone able and willing to take advantage of them. Since planning *in vacuo* is a contradiction in terms, it has been necessary to assume some such broad objective. But this report has not presumed to get into the particulars of learning theory and practice, competitive systems of instruction, individual needs vs. social needs, and all the other basic questions of educational purpose.

The focus of the Academy's study has been on how to realize accepted educational objectives: in short, with the *process* of how to reach goals. Another name for this process is "planning." The study has tried to analyze the current state of the art, the prospects for improving it, and the best routes to this end.

Educational planning is a never-ending process through which educators, public officials, scholars, and citizens at large (including, be it noted, students) can best improve the performance of schools and colleges. Implicit in this definition is the need for reform, for change. For the present state of the nation's educational system (or nonsystem), gives small ground for complacency, however much opinions may differ on the specific remedies for curing the defects of education-as-usual.

The key to reforming American education is new ideas -- new ideas to challenge educational dogmas, to stimulate change, to suggest lines of research and development. Underlying new ideas must be a spirit of enquiry and experiment which constantly asks: Why? Why twelve years in the lower schools? Why four years for the bachelor's degree? Why this subject or that? Why a particular student-teacher ratio? Why is five the right age to start school? The whys are endless.

But public policy for American education has not evolved in ways that foster such continual questioning, or that facilitate change. Our educational enterprise is not organized to encourage progress or to meet rapidly changing needs.

Whereas organization should serve purpose, in American education the order is almost reversed: entrenched organization virtually dictates purpose and hinders, if it does not actually prohibit, needed change. The nation has never really made the transition from the era when education was a purely private or local concern to the present day and to the full recognition of the national stake in education. Only recently have we begun to move toward this recognition.

Furthermore, in a democracy that values and wants to preserve pluralism, the scattered forces operating on education compound the difficulties of formulating clear-cut procedures for developing and carrying out public policies. But these difficulties do not absolve us from making the effort to find out what we are doing now in education, why we are doing it, and how we can do it better.

Education must be viewed in broad perspective. Public policies profoundly affect every part of our educational system, and indeed the quality of our society as a whole. If any enterprise engages man's innermost values, hopes, and responsibilities, it is nurturing the young -- and taking care not to do them more harm than good. What America does now about the education of its young, in the schools and colleges, at home and in the community, will in large part determine the society our children build in the decades ahead.

Today many educational innovations are on the verge of wide adoption -- or adaptation. Ten years from now American education is likely to have changed profoundly. But how will it have changed? For if educators do not plan for change, change will overtake them, in response to specific crises and to pressure from special interest groups. Instead of creating a tapestry, we will find ourselves handing down another patchwork quilt.

Today corporate, governmental, scholarly, and philanthropic organizations are systematically trying to discern the probable effect of the future on their particular enterprises or on society as a whole. These projections, rigorous and disciplined, mark a new stage in man's efforts to control his destiny. They are based not on speculation but on hard data, and related to specific policies, not wishful dreams.

Educators, and officials concerned with education should heed this comprehensive approach to planning. Their attitude should be open-minded and eclectic as they try to map out alternatives. They should not approach the future with fixed conceptions as to what it will bring and what education must be like. Nor should they view educational planning merely as a technical problem in resource allocation or systems design. Rather, the future should be seen as a challenge -- a challenge demanding precise and yet flexible judgments and plans.

In nearly every aspect of education, troublesome questions and uncertainties loom. Here are some major issues that educators must take account of in their planning, and that should concern any national mechanism that can be developed for more effective educational planning:

- The growing size and the changing nature of the student population wanting to pursue higher education.

- Constant change in the volume and structure of knowledge, with implications for the curriculum at all levels of education.
- Developments in educational technology and new methods of instruction (including no instruction at all), and their potential effects on teaching, facilities, and staffing.
- The expanding service role of higher education carried out through such means as direct action programs, contract research, and programs of continuing education.
- The financial needs of education including the sources and forms of support, and the differing problems faced by public as against private institutions.
- The legal rights and responsibilities of institutions and of individuals (students and faculty), and their relationships and responsibilities to each other and to the community.
- The continuing need for useful information -- by institutions, government, foundations, etc., -- and

for timely communication among all concerned.

- The role, scope, and impact of government; the consequences of statewide or regional governance and coordination and of intra-governmental planning, and the future federal role as exercised through money, through information, and through directives.
- The potential for joint cooperative activities on a much enlarged scale among institutions here and abroad.
- The problems of managing institutions, exploiting new techniques, and devising new tools to meet new problems.
- The effectiveness of educational and financial planning within and among institutions and governments.
- The nurturing in American education of fruitful diversity.
- The growing number of special interest groups and their role in furthering educational objectives.

3. REQUISITE STEPS TO MEET THE CURRENT CRISIS IN EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

To respond to the urgency of education's needs and to the challenge of the future, we need to make better plans. If planning fails to match the national scope of education's problems, all our talk about innovation and change will go for nothing. There are today centers of educational development and leadership all around the country, pockets of educational innovation. But we know little of how to evaluate these seminal programs, nor how to relate them to education in general.

A. America needs a national educational policy that reflects and coordinates contributions by all sectors.

The past two decades have produced a flood of federal legislation in support of education -- more in the last six years alone than in the entire previous history of the country. It has been designed to help meet the needs of preschool, elementary and secondary, vocational, and higher education, stimulating facilities construction, curriculum development, research, student financial aid, institutional development, teacher training, and programs of special assistance to previously neglected students. The funds appropriated for these and other educationally-related programs bring the total of the federal government's annual support for education to over $12 billion, making it the largest single supporter of the nation's total educational effort.

One piece of legislation has crowded upon another with no attempt to fit the new laws into any overall scheme of educational policy. As a result, separate pieces of legislation (directed to specific problems) have tended to create an overall policy, rather than the reverse.

Education is woven into our total social fabric. Because all segments of society depend upon education, they all share the responsibility to improve the true productiveness of our schools, colleges, and other avenues -- formal and informal -- of learning. Business, industry, and the professions, to select examples from the private sector, have a great stake in the quality of American education: if education is to meet the urgent demands of the future, wider participation by such groups is mandatory. They must participate not only in the educational process itself, as many industries and professions already do through programs for their employees or professional membership, but also in decisions affecting the quality of our formal educational system.

These "outside" efforts include not only the training and retraining conducted by business and the professions but a wide range of other activities such as: programs sponsored by the armed forces and other groups within the federal government; curriculum development and the design, production, and distribution of educational materials;

information handling and transmission; programs of domestic and foreign assistance in which education plays a large part; independent study programs; the development of technological hardware and software; and activities of all kinds in the literary, visual, and performing arts.

At present no all-encompassing framework correlates these wide-ranging contributions to the total educational effort. We call on business and industry to help educate ghetto-dwellers, for example, but provide them limited opportunities to relate what they do or could do to other educational programs directed towards the same end. We speak of television's potential to improve education, but have no means for assessing the national impact of television on education, nor for encouraging its integration into other educational efforts. We talk of the need to innovate, but have no means to reap the insights of "far out" educational experimenters, educational entrepreneurs, and others who are far happier with innovation and change than most people in our educational system, and who might contribute greatly toward basic reforms.

The prime need in educational planning today is some kind of framework to encourage all elements of education at all levels to work together -- traditional and innovative, public and private, sectarian and nonsectarian, proprietary and nonprofit, formal and informal. The vindication of America's pluralistic system of education depends on establishing strong working relationships among these sectors. A clearly-stated national policy on education is basic to this partnership.

B. The many educational programs carried on within the federal government need better coordination.

Federal support of education is not monolithic; it emanates from numerous departments and agencies, which often have primary interests other than education. This diffusion reflects not merely past legislative and political history, but the interweaving of education throughout society.

Committees within the federal government are charged with coordinating federal activities in education, but to small effect. Although most federal agencies assess their programs to some degree, there exists no capability for an overall evaluation of the federal effect on our pluralistic educational system, or for relating it to national needs. The individual federal and state agencies responsible for specific programs in support of education lack both capability and authority to take this broad view.

C. Education must hold a much higher position than it now holds in the structure of federal government.

Americans, especially the economically exploited and racially oppressed, realize what education could do for them, and want the right kind of educational opportunities. The ultimate target for their demands is the federal government. Legislators and appointed officials are finding themselves forced to give education more time and attention.

In the Academy's judgment, education's close connection with the most urgent problems of our society mandates the upgrading of the importance of education among federal concerns. This judgment is hardly shocking: numerous task forces, private organizations, and leading citizens have stressed the same need, some recommending advisory groups (either temporary or permanent) within the White House or "close to the President," others calling for a Department of Education. And, in fact, recent years have seen some structural change and development to reflect this concern. The creation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the designation of the Commissioner of Education as Assistant Secretary of HEW for Education, and the proliferation of units within the Office of Education and other federal agencies indicate a trend towards greater emphasis on education in the federal government. The trend has also been seen from time to time in the appointment of advisers to the President on educational matters.

D. America needs better, more sensitive, more effective comprehensive long-range planning by schools, colleges and universities, and states.

At present, institutional and statewide planning is not strong enough to play its proper role in policy direction, and is in danger of becoming submerged altogether in the powerful currents set in motion by massive federal funding. Yet, if our nation, with extensive but finite resources, is to provide the kinds of educational experiences needed in the years ahead, it must continue to depend heavily on federal support for both public and private education. Ways must be found, then, to improve the capacity of our educational institutions to map out stronger, more responsive plans, so that increased public support will not mean loss of institutional autonomy and the educational diversity essential to democracy.

At the present time, this increased dependence on the federal government has created doubts as to whether it will be possible to maintain the autonomy and special qualities of many institutions and agencies which -- through historical precedent or constitutional conferral -- have traditionally exercised control over many aspects of our educational system. As traditional state and local methods for supporting schools become more unwieldy and in some cases prolong inequities in educational opportunity, especially in elementary and secondary schools, educational institutions increasingly look to the funds provided by the more broadly based federal system of taxation. State governments also look to the federal government for greater support for education on a less restricted basis.

Accepting federal funds relieves the worst pressures, but gives rise to others. In the eyes of some educators, the ways in which aid is distributed has the long-term effect of undermining the strength and flexibility of individual institutions. This concern is especially prevalent in higher education, where multiplying costs and enrollment, together with the need to accept increased social responsibilities, are putting severe strains on traditional sources of support. And, as federal funds account for a larger and larger proportion of their total budget, however, many institutional leaders find themselves subject to new strains -- such as the cyclical nature of federal funding procedures.

They find that federal funds for programs of research, facilities construction, student-aid programs, and special "remedial" courses for the ill-prepared high school graduate are redirecting the overall purposes of their institutions in subtle but irrevocable ways. They discover in short, that they have relinquished a substantial measure of control over their own futures, not to a grand design of their own making or even one in which they play a well-defined role, but to an aggregate of often unrelated federal programs which are designed to meet some urgent need in our society and are not directly concerned with the goals or well-being of individual institutions. If our schools are to regain control of their own destinies, they must improve their capability to make comprehensive long-range plans.

E. The federal government, states, and educational institutions need more and better-trained planners for education.

The number of much-needed planning technicians who can assemble data from a wide variety of sources continues to grow. So does the number of high-level administrators who conceive of their job as "managing the future." Development of well-trained people to execute the spectrum of tasks between these extremes, however, continues to lag. American education needs new programs to train such planners, programs that emphasize the relationship of planning techniques to all parts of education, the involvement of educational leadership in the planning process, and the preparation by planners of alternatives for future action that will really help education's leaders.

Academy evaluation of educational planning by institutions and government supports the idea that good planning need not depend on complex and highly sophisticated methods. A large planning staff, extensive computer facilities, and quantities of graphs and charts do not guarantee good planning. In fact, a frequent complaint of college administrators is that they are snowed under by so much information assembled in such complicated forms that they can't use it. If the criterion for good planning is the extent to which it influences policy and guides major institutional decisions, then some excellent planning is being carried out in those colleges whose only planning "resource" is a president who understands the planning process and is himself actively involved in it.

On the other hand, it is clear that pertinent information, organized sensibly, helps an administrator test out his intuitive judgments. The growing complexity of educational management and administration, including relationships with government legislative and budgetary processes, requires this kind of hard information and careful planning. If the management of education is to remain in the hands of educators, they need to know more than they now do about the processes and techniques by which any large, complicated organization charts its course.

In the judgment of the officers of the Academy, the preparation of planners and managers for education -- in institutions and government agencies -- should include the study of techniques and tools of modern business management as they apply or can be adapted to education. The degree to which these techniques must be mastered depends upon the job in question: high-level administrators primarily need an informed appreciation of the processes involved in planning, whereas planning officers need a thorough mastery of essential techniques.

The need for greater understanding of planning and management techniques is not limited to school and college administrators. Responsibility for educational planning and management increasingly rests with federal and state agencies, legislative councils, school boards, regional organizations, trustees, etc. The network of public support for schools and universities has grown, and with it the need for people who understand educational problems and the best ways to anticipate change.

Training for educational planners should cover such topics as:

- Program analysis, including the evaluation of program objectives, costs, and effectiveness.

- Educational cost accounting. This should include the cost per student credit hour of courses, departments, and research units. It would analyze the allocation of faculty time, faculty productivity, and the overhead expense chargeable to specific programs. The relationship of marginal cost and average cost of programs should also be discussed.

- The planning of new educational and research programs. The procedure should be analogous to a corporation's development of new products. Market research, projected costs, contribution to educational objectives, methods of evaluating success, and procedures for termination in the event of failure -- these should all be considered before a new program is established.

- The nature and process of planning. Institutional organization, decision-making and reviewing procedures, automatic re-evaluation and updating of plans -- these are all major elements to be studied. So are methods of including faculty and students, along with administrators, in the planning process.

- The interrelationship of policy decisions and costs. The analysis of faculty loads, faculty-student ratios, class size, enrollment growth, tuition charges and external resources (if any), space requirements, and the special character of the institution in question must all be understood before long-range planning makes sense.

- Long-range planning. The background developed in the foregoing subjects is a prerequisite for the study of long-range planning. While long-range budget projection underlies all such planning, many related policy decisions (on growth, for example, educational methods, internal versus external financing) would enter into any viable long-range plan.

F. Better and more readily available information is needed for making educational policies.

The Academy's investigations revealed a serious lack of hard, up-to-date educational information of the kind that is readily available in other areas critical to national well-being, such as the economic fields. This lack is felt at all levels -- national, state, and institutional. It prevents careful evaluations and appraisals of present conditions, and hinders effective plans for the future.

It would be possible to close part of the information gap by adopting faster, more uniform, and more comprehensive systems to gather and disseminate certain kinds of familiar data -- data, e.g., on present and projected enrollment, costs, facilities, faculty -- for all kinds of educational undertakings from preschool through continuing education, accredited and non-accredited. Included in such data would be the many educational programs offered by agencies in the federal government, and by organizations such as industrial firms and the many proprietary schools that are not usually considered to be in the educational mainstream.

Other information now lacking only research can supply. Some of this needed research the U.S. Office of Education and other governmental, quasi-governmental, and private groups are now conducting, but not on the scale or from the extensive data base conditions demand.

How, for example, do various kinds of federal and state aid to education affect institutions? What is their effect on extending educational opportunities? on meeting national needs? What sorts of education do projected manpower needs require? How much would it cost to offer post-secondary education to everyone who seeks it? If universal post-secondary education is turning into an "inalienable right," how should our high schools respond?

Both institutions and state and federal government agencies need this kind of information. The authority of individual institutions, cities and states to make decisions governing their operations gives meaning to the concepts of decentralization and local autonomy. However, today too much decision-making, especially at the institution level, is done in the dark. Educators know very little about the combinations and permutations of the three primary elements in the educational process: students, faculty, and facilities. They can only guess at what would happen if they introduced a new curriculum, changed the teacher-student ratio, adopted new admissions policies, or merged with another institution.

The federal government, too, if it is to balance its influence on institutional and state educational activities with a greater awareness of how this influence is felt, needs more information on these basic issues. What are the effects of various kinds of federal aid on the institutions through which this aid is channeled? What is the proper federal role in student aid vs. institutional and state aid? Do these federal programs further broad national policies in education at the most reasonable cost to the tax-payer?

The lack of enough pertinent information prevents the kind of well-informed planning needed to shape national policy and legislation, as well as the policies of individual schools and colleges. No public authority is responsible for ensuring that critical issues influencing education receive sufficient coordinated attention. There is no accepted channel to bring the best thinking on these issues to bear on the debate among educators and legislators who would plan for our educational institutions and the agencies that support them.

Private foundations and research organizations in recent years have generated a great deal of broadly based research that can be of significant help in the future. But, as stated earlier in this report, private groups by definition have no responsibility for the general welfare, nor can they mount legislative programs.

The future requires educational research so situated to influence national political decisions that affect education. The enormous growth in federal support for education over the last decade has sharpened the impact of these political decisions, and the need to base them on pertinent, trust-worthy, and timely information.

G. Standards and formats for institutions to follow in submitting data, long-range plans, and requests for funds to the federal government must be developed.

Government planning suffers from the lack of standard forms for institutions to use in setting forth their present and anticipated needs when they request support from the federal government. An Academy study prepared this year for the National Institutes of Health documented this lack in graduate and professional schools. Investigations for the present study indicate that the same condition prevents comparisons among institutions and inhibits planning at all educational levels.

Government officials responsible for disbursing public funds are besieged by schools and universities with requests for money. Institutions, however, can seldom document their costs, nor sources of money to meet them. The government, in effect, is asked for funds on the reasonable but hardly specific argument that educational expansion of all kinds is needed. Demands of this order are likely to increase.

However, as money becomes tighter, officials can expect Congress to exercise greater scrutiny of these federal programs. As Congress demands greater accountability from federal administrators, these administrators will need more comprehensive documentation from institutions. If an institution, when requesting funds for specific programs, gave the government a better idea of how those specific programs fitted into its long-range plan (and into the emerging pattern of national needs and priorities), the benefits to both the institution and the government would be considerable. The institution would be required to think through its plans more thoroughly, and the government would have a better idea of how its money was being spent, and what it was expected to accomplish.

4. HOW CAN NATIONAL PLANNING HELP?

If educational planning stands in need of basic improvement, what is called for is not new federal agencies responsible for this or that part of our educational system. Nor, in the Academy's judgment, does the federal responsibility for education demand a highly centralized control over the nation's educational future.

For many educators, it is true, "national planning" inevitably means greatly increased control by the federal government, with many institutional responsibilities transferred to some central agency. Granted, the dangers of centralized control are no mere chimera. The Academy finds no reason to believe, however, that national planning should imply such "control." National planning for education should support the marshalling of all our educational resources -- national, state, local, and institutional, formal and informal -- which share the ultimate task of making and carrying out the many individual plans that will shape the future.

Participation in national policy and planning would vary according to the particular goal and the particular segment of the educational system concerned. Thus national planning, construed and managed wisely, should orchestrate the many diverse instruments of American education in tune with underlying national policy.

All education is supported by the public, one way or another, however the precise source of funds differs (tax levies, tax exemption, tuition payments, voluntary contributions, etc.). In order to achieve a full return on the public's dollar and more equitable support, the relationships between the many forces in American education must be fostered through varied solutions to common educational problems, and without wasteful duplication of effort.

National planning should make provisions for assessing how well education is meeting national and individual needs, as defined by national policy, and for recommending ways to improve performance. In the broad view, national planning should be concerned, not only with the well-being of education in the nation but with the well-being of the nation as it is served by education. In taking a stronger part in national planning, as thus construed, the federal government would assume a more responsible and powerful -- but in no sense monolithic -- role.

National planning for education would not transfer responsibility or power from individual institutions to a centralized federal ministry any more than national planning has in the health fields. The analogy suggests the opposite effect. The Public Health Service Act sets as a national goal the promotion and assurance of the highest attainable level of health care for every person. To achieve this goal, the Act seeks to promote an effective partnership among governmental bodies, institutions, organizations, and individuals. Federal financial assistance, the Act states, "must be directed to support the marshalling of all health resources -- national, state and local."

To summarize: National planning for education is a process through which the planning capabilities of all the diverse elements of our educational system are strengthened and focused so that these elements may contribute toward national educational policy -- providing educational opportunities for all those able, seeking, and willing to learn; and insuring that education may continue to support the general well-being of the nation.

> The appropriate role of the federal government in this process is to support a stated national policy on education; to strengthen local, state, and institutional planning capabilities for education; to tailor features of federal funding of education so as to encourage effective future planning by all educational segments; to provide the means for assessing the degree to which all educational effort is working towards national policy; and to make sure that members of the Executive and Legislative branches of the government concerned with education

clearly understand nationwide needs.

The appropriate role of each state government is to continue to develop and coordinate its comprehensive planning capabilities for education; to inform state legislative and executive authorities of statewide educational needs; to establish procedures of state support that will encourage local and institutional comprehensive planning; and to cooperate with the federal government and with other states in providing information needed to assess the nation's educational progress.

The appropriate role for each public and private educational institution, and for every other organization concerned with education is to clearly define its proper contribution to national educational policy, and under this broad rubric, to develop comprehensive plans for the future that, building from its particular strength and purposes, will insure the broad range of diverse educational opportunities the nation requires.

5. EDUCATION AND THE NATIONAL INTEREST: A PROPOSAL FOR AN EDUCATION ACT OF 1970

The times call for a bold step to establish education in a new strong position in the central structure of our national government. Consistent, coherent, and well-coordinated planning for education, which is imperative to meet present and future demands, can come about only through measures that pull together into sharp focus the existing diffusion of educational activities in government and institutions. It is the Academy's conviction, reinforced by the extensive investigations underlying this report, that the need for national planning is urgent and cannot be met by halfway measures.

To sum up briefly the arguments spelled out in foregoing sections: American education, for all the pluralism and diversity that we wish to preserve, must also be viewed in its totality, as a crucial part of the nation's life. As such, it presents complex interrelated problems, pressing harder every day, that will not yield to piecemeal treatment. Conditions in the secondary schools, for example, obviously reflect and affect conditions in the grades below and the colleges and universities above. Facilities, staffing, curriculum reform are all integrally related. The intimate connection between funding and needed reforms requires no elaboration.

With the conviction, therefore, that strong measures are essential to meet the urgent needs of education and of educational planning, and in the belief that such measures would rally the necessary support, the Academy proposes that the President and Congress of the United States take a series of decisive actions to give education the priority it demands at the highest levels of the national government.

These actions could well be embodied in an Education Act of 1970, or they could be enacted (though with a corresponding diminution of force) in separate pieces of legislation. Whatever the form or sequence, the Academy believes that the first order of business would be for the Congress to declare a broad national policy with respect to education.

The declaration might begin with the recognition that the nation's general well-being, its economic growth, its strength and freedom, and the quality of every citizen's life are inextricably bound up with the quality and extent of the education the nation provides. Education is, in short, a major national resource. Therefore, the declaration might continue, the Congress conceives it to be the continuing policy and responsibility of the federal government, consistent with the Constitutional rights, the privileges, and the duties of the states, to create and maintain conditions which will provide appropriate opportunities, including self-education, for those able and wanting to learn; and to encourage the development of such conditions by assisting federal, state, local, and institutional planning agencies in their efforts toward this end.

Having declared a national policy, the Congress should then require an annual Education Report by the President of the United States. This report, prepared in consultation with appropriate officers of the Executive and Legislative branches, would be transmitted to Congress shortly after the beginning of each regular session. It would set forth (1) the extent of educational opportunities in the United States, their quality, and improvements needed to carry out the national policy as declared by Congress; (2) current and foreseeable trends in education; (3) a review of the education program of the federal government during the preceding year and its effect upon educational opportunities in this country; and (4) a program for carrying out the declaration of policy, together with such recommendations for legislation as were deemed necessary or desirable. The President could also transmit from time to time to the Congress supplementary reports, covering any additional or revised recommendations.

The foregoing moves, important as they are in themselves, would serve as prologue to action the Academy believes is long overdue: the establishment of a Department of Education, headed by a Secretary of Cabinet rank. The Academy concurs in the arguments advanced for transforming the Office of Education into a full-fledged Department -- arguments that have been urged almost from the moment the Office was created: greater influence for the federal educational arm within the hierarchy of other federal programs; greater opportunities to involve men and women with the variety of expertise and background that the future demands; the possibility for pulling together some of the federal programs in support of education that are now in other departments.

A Secretary of Education sitting with the Cabinet could forcefully project the educational needs of the nation and the requisite role therein of the federal government. With respect to national planning for education, the elevation of education to a seat in the Cabinet would strengthen the advocacy within the federal government of education's needs, and by ensuring better coordination, would help to encourage more effective national planning for education.

The Academy believes that other measures should be taken to strengthen education and educational planning concurrent with the establishment of a Department of Education. In order for the Department to bring the country's great diversity of educational effort into a scheme of national planning, the Congress should include in the legislation establishing a Department of Education the creation of a Council of Educational Advisers, to report to the Secretary of Education.

The Council should be composed of from three to seven members appointed by the Secretary, to serve full time, at a salary sufficient to attract highly qualified people. Ideally they should be educational statesmen of the first rank (not all professional educators), beholden to no constitutency whether institutional or organizational. Each council member should, by virtue of his experience and attainments, be exceptionally equipped to analyze and interpret developments in education, to appraise federal programs in the light of national policy, and to formulate and recommend programs and policies to the Secretary.

The Council of Educational Advisers, if suitably empowered and staffed, could serve the Secretary in many important ways, and advise him in carrying out important duties relating to the improvement of national planning. Among these duties of the Secretary would be the following:

- acting as the principal federal officer responsible for the coordination of all federal programs in support of education, especially in his role as chairman of the Federal Interagency Committee on Education.
- assisting and advising the President in the preparation of the Education Report.
- gathering timely and authoritative information on developments and trends in education, establishing indicators that would measure these trends and developments against needs, analyzing and interpreting such information in the light of national policy, and conducting appropriate studies.
- developing and recommending to the President national policies which will foster additional educational opportunities for the people of this country.
- furnishing such studies, reports, and recommendations on matters of federal educational policy and legislation as the President may request.
- encouraging the development of common guidelines and standards for data collection and reporting, and for institu-

tional and statewide planning to be followed by educational institutions and by state and federal government agencies concerned with education. (The Secretary of Education should require that states or institutions requesting federal funds for education submit plans following these guidelines.)

- assisting the Education Commission of the States in the establishment of means to collect and disseminate planning information among the states, and to hold conferences on planning for state and institutional planning officers.

The Academy believes that the Congress should take other steps beyond the creation of a Department of Education with its Council of Advisers. One would be to appropriate sufficient funds, to be matched by the states, to strengthen the capabilities of state agencies to carry out comprehensive planning for education at all levels.

Another would be to appropriate funds to establish programs in the nation's educational institutions and agencies to train planners. Both programs would be supervised by the Department of Education. In this regard, it would be desirable to appropriate sufficient funds for the establishment of a National Institute for Educational Management (as proposed in the recent report of the Commission on Instructional

Technology) to undertake the research, development, and application of ideas related to improved planning and management techniques for education.

To ensure that Congress acquires a full and balanced picture of educational conditions and needs, the Academy proposes the creation of a Joint Committee on Education, to be composed of the senior members of the Senate and House committees concerned with education. It would be the chief function of this Joint Committee to make a continuing study of issues raised by the proposed Education Report by the President of the United States, to file an annual report with the Senate and House of Representatives of its findings and recommendations with respect to the main points of the President's report, and to make such other educational reports and recommendations as it deems advisable.

* * * *

The Academy proposes the creation of a Department of Education, a Council of Educational Advisers, a Joint Education Committee, and stronger institutional and state planning capabilities in the conviction that only such major steps will give education the strength and status it requires in the federal structure. In the Academy's judgment the deep involvement of education in the most urgent problems of our society both requires and justifies this new importance.

The Academy believes that the foregoing recommendations offer the best hope for matching America's educational systems to her dreams and hopes. There are, of course, other procedures, of more limited scope, that could be adopted as alternatives to the enactment of the "Education Act of 1970," or its components, as recommended in this report, all of which the Academy considered but rejected as inadequate basic solutions to the urgent requirements of education and of educational planning. One would be centered solely on the creation of a Council of Educational Advisers reporting to the President. Other alternatives include calling a White House conference on national planning for education, and -- the proposal upon which this study was originally based -- the convening of a National Congress to Guide the Growth of Higher Education. With the adoption of the major recommendations outlined in the proposed "Education Act of 1970," the government would be so structured as to make better use of special commissions and ad hoc groups, especially in the establishment of national priorities. By themselves, however, these alternatives would fail to provide a sufficient response to the national need that this study has set forth.

6. CONCLUSION

Education tomorrow will be bigger in every way. We can, with present methods, chart the rate of growth of our institutions in a number of areas, but simply encouraging growth along present lines will not be enough. We must encourage new ways of looking at a future that will be not only bigger but different. And having encouraged innovation, we must create the means through which innovative ideas can make their way into the mainstream of our educational systems.

But how are we to decide which innovative ideas? How are we to direct public policy down the right road? Education can no more respond to future needs without the support of enlightened public policy than can other areas vital to our national well-being for which we have already developed highly sophisticated "indicators". Today, for instance, we use something called "econometrics" to describe the present economy and to predict the future consequences for national economic health of various alternative courses of public policy. Econometrics -- an analytic tool that partakes of both science and art -- provides an inclusive format within which to examine the web of complex interrelationships that constitutes the American economy.

In terms of our understanding of the relationship between public policy and educational planning, we are in many ways at the same point we were forty years ago in respect to economics. Forty years ago the use of econometrics would have been unthinkable, and the need for it deemed unwarranted and in fact harmful to our free-enterprise system. Today we take for granted continuous, almost daily analysis of the economic state of the nation. We look to federal groups such as the Council of Economic Advisers, the Joint Economic Committee, and other public and private groups to tell us how we are faring economically, and to recommend alternative public policies, as needed, to encourage our economic well-being and to preserve free enterprise as we know it. Neither of these ends, we have come to realize, could be guaranteed today without government guidance based on a well-developed national capability for interpreting economic trends.

Our various aspirations for individual educational achievement depend on an enlightened public educational policy, and on the planning efforts of everyone concerned with education. Just as public policy in economics, far from endangering the free-enterprise system, has been instrumental in its preservation, so intelligent national planning in education can nurture the pluralism of our educational system and encourage its innovative response to the future.

Appendix A

EVOLVING CONCEPTIONS OF THE FEDERAL ROLE IN EDUCATION, AS ANALYZED IN MAJOR REPORTS ON EDUCATION, 1929-1969

The expansion of American education from its earliest efforts into the second largest enterprise in the country (after defense) has influenced, and been influenced by, the evolving federal role in support of education. Because there is no constitutional directive as to the federal government's responsibilities for education, its role has been largely shaped through its response to specific areas of need. As these areas have grown and multiplied in recent years, the federal government's involvement has increased to the point where it now provides the largest single source of funds in support of education, and stands as the greatest potential contributor to improved educational planning at all levels.

Over the past several decades a number of public and private groups have been appointed to study the nature of federal support to education, and to make recommendations as to its appropriate role. In this chapter, the trends and emphases in the major reports from 1929 to the present are summarized. (A listing of these reports, followed by a detailed summary of the most relevant , begins on page A-9).

From 1929 to 1950, the governmental and nongovernmental reports on education were marked by a common agreement that the federal role should grow and diversify. The constant theme was equalization of educational opportunity at all levels as a national goal. The argument was that nongovernmental financial resources were not adequate and state leadership was deficient. Although local and state efforts were encouraged the ultimate equalizing resource was seen as the federal government, providing stable support through the states for broad-gauge purposes.

In order to fulfill its potential, the federal educational agency was expected to do more research and distribute more information. Its elevation to cabinet status was suggested in 1929, as was intergovernmental agency coordination. In 1947, a National Board of Education, and a National Commission on Higher Education were recommended.

An expansion of public education at all levels was predicted. The abolition of state matching requirements was suggested. General, student and capital construction aid in the form of loans, scholarships, work-study programs, and outright grants were recommended in larger numbers. The expansion of adult education and community colleges was seen as needing federal support.

In brief, educational inadequacies and the goal of equal opportunity combined to suggest the priority of national over local. The anticipated expansion of the public system suggested an expanded federal involvement in various forms of aid to states, institutions, and individuals.

The governmental and nongovernmental reports on education of the 1950's tended to de-emphasize the federal role. They emphasized the adequacy of nongovernmental financial resources. They equated federal support with controls and a loss of freedom, and so called for a halt in federal aid except for research, medical education, student assistance, housing loans and emergency situations like school construction or in circumstances where federal aid was deemed essential. They claimed the financial barriers to individual opportunity were exaggerated. They encouraged private higher education. Towards the end of the decade, the reality of federal aid was at least implicitly accepted, and one group, the Committee on Education Beyond the High School, even recommended larger as well as new programs of federal scholarships and housing loans, but only as "stop-gap" measures. It also suggested that a policy and review board of laymen work with the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. Most groups encouraged tax-law revision and more endowment income.

The governmental and nongovernmental groups meeting in the 1960's picked up the concerns of the pre-1950 period, finding considerable inequity of opportunity and widespread mediocrity in American education. John Gardner struck the decade's keynote by calling in 1960 for the design of a more active role for the federal government while preserving local control for public education and college and university autonomy.

The suggestions concerning the federal structure were many. A National Education Foundation, similar to the National Science Foundation, was recommended, as were a Council of Educational Advisers working with the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare but responsible to the White House, and an independent Office of Education at the Presidential level, similar to the Office of Economic Opportunity. The longstanding recommendation that education be raised to cabinet status was repeated. A National Council on Higher Learning in the office of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare as forum, adviser and spokesman was suggested, as was the strengthening of the Federal Interagency Committee on Education to coordinate all federal higher education programs. Improving and enlarging the Office of Education's statistical and research services was frequently recommended, and one group suggested that the Office of Education was the only agency in the United States that could and should conduct a periodic national assessment of education.

New and frequent themes in the 1960's were sounded in calls for aid to the disadvantaged, metropolitan areas, and for greater racial integration. They were coupled with the common conviction that the breadth and depth of the nation's education problems either would not or could not be solved by states. A sense of national urgency prevailed.

The number of directions recommended for federal support mirrored the problems that needed solving. The reports recommended federal support in new areas indicated by community action programs, metropolitan demonstration projects, education programs for the aging, industry-operated schools, affiliations of colleges and universities, strengthening state departments of education, the Teachers Corps, National Educational Laboratories, new learning centers, compensatory programs, experimental curricula, free freshman year, graduate student support, new technology, international education, "developing" colleges, research, paraprofessional and professional training programs, and cost-of-education allowances. They favored more and different kinds of student aid, capital construction grants and loans, vocational, professional and paraprofessional education and training programs, and research monies. They opposed tax credits and were usually in favor of general aid, especially for colleges and universities. One group recommended federal sanctions as a spur to equalizing educational opportunity.

By 1967, the reports also began to show an awareness of the advantages and disadvantages of the different ways in which federal aid and support could be given. While continuing to favor categorical aid and student aid, they gave attention to various forms of institutional grants as well. In 1969, the President-elect's Task Force on Education called for "designated block grants" to aid broader developments on the basis of federally-designated priorities, while allowing states and institutions great latitude in their specific use. The same task force also strongly opposed general aid on the grounds that it would re-open the church-state controversy, delay civil rights, promote maldistribution of funds, and that it constituted a political power Congress would not relinquish. It also opposed direct student aid as promoting resistance to desegregation.

In summary, the governmental and non-governmental reports of the 1960's, taking a different view from their 1950's predecessors of the financial capacities of non-governmental sources, re-affirmed the need to expand the federal role in support of both public and private education.

- They emphasized the need for attending to national priorities, particularly equal educational opportunity, the needs of the disadvantaged and the cities, the needs of the individual, and the necessary growth of graduate, adult, and professional education.

- While they suggested increasing the amount of federal aid, they confined the federal role to supplementing local, state and nongovernmental sources of support and leadership.

- They affirmed the principle of aid through the states and encouraged aid that would take the financial sting out of certain types of college and university federally-financed projects and grants.

- They called for a consistent and coordinated policy of federal aid and leadership, and for a stronger federal office of education, but hedged on defining clearly their frequent references to a "national" policy for education.

- They offered a wide variety of responses to categorical needs as a substitute for structural and procedural reformation that would unify and simplify the federal role, which suggests that restrictions upon the method of federal support encouraged remarkable versatility in innovations, with the indirect effect of creating new national emphases.

- They usually recommended general aid to education, but did not specify the ways and means of distributing it, and thus left this vital issue unresolved.

- The suggestions for broad-purpose grants, which in themselves carried the method of support one step

> further from categorical grants, omitted all details concerning its implementation. Such suggestions as broad-purpose grants do, however, indicate a move toward simpler formulae. Combined with more unified legislation, this trend might suggest new definitions of the structure and process of federal leadership in attaining national educational goals.

Elements of the recommendations of these commissions to expand federal participation in public and private education have been put into effect in the last few years, not always in the proportions needed, but usually in the directions indicated. The results of this increased participation make more imperative the need for greater coordination of all educational efforts, and underline the need for the comprehensive approach uniting policy with planning.

Major National Education Reports
1929 - 1969

(The reports of those groups preceded by a number are summarized in the pages following this listing).

National Advisory Committee on Education 1929

National Conference on the Financing of Education 1933

U.S. Advisory Committee on Education 1936

White House Conference on Children in a Democracy 1939

National Resources Planning Board 1939

American Youth Commission 1940

Committee on Planning for Education 1941

National Committee on Coordination in Secondary Education 1941

Committee on Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations 1943

Interstate Committee on Postwar Reconstruction and Development 1944 (Council of State Covernments)

Educational Policies Commission and the Problems and Policies Committee 1945

Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government 1947

Commission on Implications of Armed Services Educational Programs 1947

(1) President's Commission on Higher Education 1947

Mid-Century White House Conference on Children and Youth 1950

(2) Commission of the Association of American Universities on Financing Higher Education 1952

(3) Staff Report of the Commission on Financing Higher Education, Association of American Universities 1952

Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government 1953

Commission on Intergovernmental Relations 1953

National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools 1954
(a privately incorporated group)

(4) *White House Conference on Education* 1956

(5) *President's Committee on Education Beyond High School* 1956

The Rockefeller Panel on Education 1958
(a privately funded, ad hoc group)

President's Committee on Scientists and Engineers 1958

(6) *President's Commission on National Goals* 1960

(7) *President's Task Force Committee on Education* 1961

White House Conference on Aging 1961

Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education 1962

Advisory Panel on Educational Statistics to U.S. Commissioner of Education 1963

(8) *President's Task Force on Education* 1964

(9) *White House Conference on Education* 1965

White House Conference "To Fulfill These Rights" 1966

Committee to Review Relationships Between Federal Agencies and Private Organizations 1967

(10) *President's Task Force on Education* 1967

(11) *Association of American Universities* 1968

(12) *Advisory Committee on Higher Education to the Secretary of Health, Education & Welfare* 1968

(13) Carnegie Commission on the Future of Higher Education
(Alternative Methods of Federal Funding for Higher Education) 1968

(14) Carnegie Commission on the Future of Higher Education
(Quality and Equality) 1968

(15) Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare

(16) American Council on Education 1969

(17) President-elect's Task Force on Education 1969

(1) Name: Higher Education for American Democracy (Volumes I-VI)

Date: 1947

By: The President's Commission on Higher Education

The Commission, of 28 members, was appointed by the President of the United States on July 13, 1946 to examine the functions of higher education in the United States and the means by which they could best be performed. George Zook, Chairman.

Goals:

- To educate for a fuller realization of democracy in every phase of living.
- To educate for international understanding and cooperation.
- To educate for the application of creative imagination and trained intelligence to the solution of social problems and to the administration of public affairs.
- To provide a unified general education for American youth, and an integrated liberal and vocational education throughout the student's college life.

Conclusions:

Education and law are the two instruments by which society establishes, maintains and protects equality.

Segregation and discriminations are ruinous; legislation against it is fitting and proper.

Liberal education must not end with the fourteenth grade.

At least 49% of our population has the mental ability to complete 14 years of schooling with a curriculum of general and vocational studies. At least 32% of our population has the mental ability to complete an advanced education.

In mass education, counseling is essential.

Students must have every possible experience in democratic processes within the college community.

Overemphasis on science research and teaching must be avoided.

An acute shortage of doctors is expected by 1960. More medical, dental, and lab technicians will be needed.

The quota system of selective admission to many professional schools is wholly indefensible.

Graduate education must do research and train research personnel, train teachers for all levels of higher education, and train experts for a host of services in nonacademic fields.

Social research must be included in any program of federal support; basic research will require vastly increased state and federal support.

Adult education should be raised to equality with all other levels of education.

The opportunity for higher education is excessively dependent on the individual's economic status.

The major economic barriers to college attendance are inadequacy of family income, the chance for high school graduates to earn good wages, and the high costs of attending college away from home.

Most private institutions will be able to support themselves.

Private institutions should increase the proportion of their operating income derived from gifts.

Despite a large measure of private control and support, private institutions are a part of the public interest and owe a certain degree of accountability to the public.

Colleges must be prepared and able to offset the handicap of a poor quality secondary school education.

"Fair Educational Practice" laws should be seriously considered.

Federal and state governments can best safeguard the strongest possible system of higher education by leadership rather than by authority. The federal government should not dictate concepts and procedures.

States will not be able alone to meet the expanding needs of the nation for higher education.

The community college should be general and vocational, community oriented, single-track with cooperative and adult-education available.

The United States needs more separate two and four-year small colleges or university units, located geographically in close proximity to population centers.

State Boards of Education should be appointed, with members' terms long, overlapping, unpaid and they should choose state superintendents or commissioners of education. Such state departments of education are at present weak.

A strong, aggressive federal agency encourages and stimulates local strength and initiative.

Financial aid from the federal government to states is better than direct subsidy.

The great expansion in numbers to be served by higher education will necessarily be borne by publicly controlled colleges and universities.

Recommendations:

1. A substantial part of federal support for research should be given in the form of financial assistance to undergraduate and graduate students in science as a part of an overall national scholarship/fellowship plan in all academic fields.

2. A federal Board of Student Aid should be associated with the Office of Education to administer scholarship programs.

*3. There should be no tuition or other required fees for the thirteenth and fourteenth school years in any kind of public higher educational institution.

*4. There should be established a national scholarship program of grants-in-aid for at least 20% of all undergraduates, non-veteran

---

* Asterisks before a recommendation indicate a new idea or a major emphasis.

students. The primary basis for awards should be on financial need.

*5. A similar program should be established for graduate students (10,000 in 1948-49, 20,000 in 1949-50, etc., through 1953). Selection should be by national competitive examinations.

*6. U.S. Office of Education should be given large amounts of money for an extensive program of educational research, most of it carried out by the colleges and universities for which the results are intended.

7. The U.S. Office of Education should maintain a clearinghouse on educational information.

*8. The U.S. Commissioner of Education should have the counsel and support of, and some measure of direct responsibility to an able and representative body of citizens designated by the President to be a National Commission on Higher Education.

*9. The President should set up an interdepartmental committee with a representative from each department or agency maintaining one or more educational or research programs utilizing colleges or universities. It would have no administrative authority.

10. Each association with institutional membership should consider maintaining a research program, (possibly to cooperate with appropriate government departments in conducting the research).

11. A federal guidance and counseling service should be organized in the U.S. Office of Education with an advisory committee.

*12. The U.S. Office of Education should create a strong division of adult education, and should organize a national council on adult education.

*13. The federal government should provide funds needed to avoid anticipated total public higher education deficit of $638 million by 1960, and establish its position as a strong, permanent partner in financing higher education.

*14. The federal government should aid college building programs with matching grants to states, with states supplementing insofar as their financial ability allows.

*15. The federal government should finance capital outlays for noninstructional purposes in public and private institutions on a loan basis, with low interest, on a 30-year repayment schedule.

16. All federal funds for scholarships and grants-in-aid should be paid directly to the individual.

17. All federally-erected temporary housing at colleges and universities should be donated to those institutions.

18. Federal funds should be given to support only public institutions.

19. Federal funds should be given to the states, not directly to the institutions.

20. Federal funds for the general support of institutions of higher education should be distributed among the states on an equalization basis, determined by an objective formula designed to measure the state's relative need and ability.

Costs:

Estimates of costs are based on:

- the need to serve 4,600,000 students by 1960, of which 900,000 will be served by private colleges and universities,
- the inability of local sources to do very much better than they were doing in 1945-46,
- the ability of the states to increase greatly their support,
- an anticipated yearly current operating deficit of $638 million by 1960 (beyond the maximum of local and state support)

Program	Annual costs (over and above present federal support) beginning in 1948-49:
Scholarships	$120 million (with a proportionate increase to 1952)
Fellowships	$15 million (to increase to $45 million by 1952)

General Operating	$53 million (to increase to $265 million by 1952)
Educational Facilities	$216 million (no increase before 1952)
Non-Educational	no amount given

Between 1.19% and 1.50% of the Gross National Product in the period 1947-1960 should be spent annually on higher education.

(2) Name: Nature and Needs of Higher Education

Date: 1952

By: The Commission on Financing Higher Education

A 12-member Association of American Universities Commission, John Millet, Director.

Conclusions:

The economic barrier to higher education is usually exaggerated.

The beneficiary should pay for the benefits he receives.

Possible kinds of federal support include student aid, payment for services, capital grants and gifts of surplus materials for construction, direct operating grants for instructional and/or research activities, and tax exemption.

Demands for public support from state higher education institutions will remain moderate.

The extent of federal support is the most important issue in higher education today.

Higher education cannot be universal. It is not an opportunity owed by society to all its citizens.

Higher education's first goal is to recruit and educate a much larger percentage of the top 25% of high school graduates in the United States than is now the case.

The major pressures affecting financial state of higher education are: inflation, expanded education services, fluctuating student enrollments, need for facilities, and uncertain sources of income.

The benefits of federal aid include veterans program, university research, and the training of scientists.

The disadvantages of federal aid include its threat to freedom and diversity, the dangers of centralized control of research, and the stagnation engendered by cumbersome bureaucracies.

Recommendations:

*1. Any and all new forms of direct federal support should be halted; so should student scholarship aid.

*2. Private and non-governmental support must bear the major burden of financing higher education.

(3) Name: Financing Higher Education in the United States

Date: August, 1952

By: Staff Report of the Commission on Financing Higher Education, Association of American Universities

Goals:

- To enable higher education to interest the top 25% of high-school graduates in college, and to get about 80% of that group to attend college.

Conclusions:

Mass higher education could create doubts as to its value among future employers of college graduates.

In at least half of the instances of those eligible for college who do not attend, financial difficulty is not the major deterrent.

The existence of financial barriers to higher education has often been exaggerated. In the last analysis, the decision to go to college must be determined by the individual.

There is some doubt as to whether junior colleges should be considered as secondary schooling or higher education.

Competition among institutions strengthens them more than it weakens.

Programs offered by higher education will expand; organized research will grow.

Two major factors which have determined the make-up of the higher-education student body are intellectual capacity and intellectual motivation.

American colleges and universities should make it their goal to enroll the top 25% quartile of (in terms of intellectual promise) of high school graduates. Only about 1/2 of the top 25% now go on to college.

Although an individual's own choice is the vital final determinant, other factors affecting college attendance are:

- family's educational background
- family socio-economic status
- encouragement by high school counselors and teachers
- peer influence
- proximity to an institution
- religious attitudes and loyalties
- sex (more male than female)
- racial or national origin

In 1950, expenditures for higher education were less than 1% of GNP, and less than .5% for primary and secondary schools.

A decline in per student expenditures does not necessarily prove a decline in educational quality, but such a decline in quality is taking place among private institutions.

There is a wide variation in costs of different instructional programs -- Ph. D and medical training (especially the biologies and physical sciences) very expensive, undergraduate instruction less costly than graduate education.

Liberal arts colleges too often attempt to be small-scale universities, with consequent financial difficulties.

Interinstitutional cooperation (including, where feasible, mergers) can lead to more efficient financing for higher-education institutions.

The following kinds of institutions are dependent on these sources of funds for their operating income:

Private universities	student fees
State universities	state appropriations
Municipal liberal arts colleges	state appropriations and student fees
State teachers colleges	state appropriations and student fees
Municipal junior colleges	state appropriations and student fees
Private liberal arts colleges	student fees
Private junior colleges	student fees

The rise in median family income(1940-1950)has not been attended by a similar increase in college attendance.

The further expansion and development of public higher education must be regarded as a state function.

Federal aid to education takes the form of aid to individuals, subsidy of educational activities, and the purchase of services.

The contract-research program of federal government provides no financial assistance to liberal arts colleges, and does not directly assist many of the instructional programs of universities.

Federal research income does not solve the financial problems of all activities or institutions.

Enrollment in higher education tends to rise with levels of income, with an increase in the number of high school graduates, and as the median year of school completed by all citizens rises.

The student charge is a legitimate means of financing higher education.

A special state tax earmarked for support of higher education is not advisable.

The most appropriate form of state assistance to private colleges and universities is the scholarship program.

Contract research contributes only peripherally to overall educational programs of institutions.

Federal interest in and support of research at public and private universities will probably be long-term.

The dangers of government control must be avoided.

There is no formula for the combination of individual family, private and federal support of higher education.

Recommendations:

1. Responsibility for providing funds for about half the number of the national goal for scholarship awards should be assumed by the federal government.

2. Housing loans and basic and developmental research support should be continued.

3. Medical research should be supported.

(4) Name: The Committee for The White House Conference on Education: A Report to the President

Date: April, 1956

By: The Committee for The White House Conference on Education

The Committee was composed of 34 members representing education, labor, business and journalism. It was appointed by President Eisenhower in 1954. Neil H. McElroy, Chairman.

Conclusions:

*Federal aid to public education must be increased both for school construction and school operation. The Conference was divided evenly on aid for school operation.

(Of the 53 states, regional and territorial conferences prior to the White House Conference, only six dealt with relationships of federal government to education or the functions of the Office of Education. No state was opposed to all federal aid. Fifteen states approved the principle of federal aid or federal aid for general purposes. Three states clearly opposed federal aid for general purposes or construction. A majority of states did not favor federal aid for general purposes).

Recommendations:

1. The federal government should deal with local school systems only through the responsible state school agency.

2. The U. S. Office of Education research and statistical services should be expanded.

*3. Federal aid for elementary and secondary schools should go through the U. S. Office of Education.

4. Government scholarships should not be used to recruit for specific occupations except in emergencies.

5. Federal aid for school construction should be made temporarily available on a limited basis to all states, territories, and the District of Columbia which must match it on the basis of financial ability. (The total needed by 1960 was estimated at $10-$15 billion).

Two Committee members took formal exception to the Committee's neglect of federal aid as a substantive issue.

(5) Names: First Interim Report to the President
Second Report to the President

Dates: November, 1956
July, 1957

By: The President's Committee on Education Beyond High School

A 36-member committee, appointed by President Eisenhower, representing education, business, labor, the professions and government. Devereux C. Josephs, Chairman.

The First Interim Report was a discussion document.

Goals:

. To conserve and develop human talent.

. To provide an individual with education to his fullest capacity.

. To assure genuine equality of opportunity.

Conclusions:

Higher-education institutions must be characterized by high quality, variety, and accessibility.

Huge increases in enrollment must be anticipated.

A serious shortage of trained, competent people exists in almost every field, including a serious shortage of teachers and a lack of adequate facilities for training them.

Much greater financial assistance for higher education will be needed in the future.

The role of the federal government in higher education should be residual, and not dominant.

Recommendations:

*1. Federal revenue laws should be revised to give tax credit to those attending college (or their families); it should be proportionately greater for the poor; and to encourage larger gifts to colleges and universities.

2. The federal College Housing Loan program should be continued.

3. National Housing Act slum-clearance money should be made available to urban colleges and universities.

4. New Federal programs of grants-in-aid should be created (on a matching basis) for academic facilities.

*5. The federal government must pay the full costs of research contracts.

6. The Office of Education's fact-finding/reporting services should be improved.

7. New review/policy machinery should be established for national and intragovernmental education aspects of education (using laymen and educators outside the government to work with the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare).

*8. A federal work-study program should be established to give aid to 25,000-50,000 able, needy students.

9. A federal scholarship program should be established only as a stop-gap measure.

10. The Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare should call a national conference on adult education.

Costs:

None given.

(6) Name: "National Goals in Education"

Chapter III of Goals for Americans, which includes the Report of the President's Commission on National Goals and various Chapters Submitted for the Consideration of the Commission. (New York: Prentice Hall, 1960) pp. 81-100.

Date: November, 1960

By: John W. Gardner for the President's Commission on National Goals

The Commission on National Goals consisted of eleven members, appointed by President Eisenhower, and representative of education, business and industry, journalism and labor. Henry M. Wriston, Chairman.

Goals:

- To make good the promise of equality.
- To remove the barriers of poverty, prejudice and ignorance to education; to salvage talent.
- To preserve local control while taking fullest advantage of federal assistance and recognizing the importance of national priorities.
- To encourage the education of women.
- To revise and improve teaching training.
- To encourage innovation in education.
- To emphasize liberal arts education at the undergraduate level.
- To support higher education in 1970 with approximately 1.9% of GNP.
- To design a more active role for the federal government that will not diminish autonomy of the colleges and universities.

Recommendations:

*1. Federal funds should be used on matching basis to modernize and expand existing medical schools and to create at least 20 two and four-year schools; states should give both public and private universities help in matching federal funds.

*2. Federally funded residence and patient-care facilities programs should be enlarged to include teaching facilities.

*3. Medical students should be given more federal and state scholarships and loans; resident physicians should be paid higher salaries.

*4. The federal government should supplement funds of any state unable to maintain adequate education.

5. The federal government should give money to all other states on a matching basis for whatever purpose the state may require.

*6. Either a Department of Education should be created at cabinet level, or a National Education Foundation, similar to the National Science Foundation.

7. A Council of Educational Advisors should be created to work with Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare and responsible to White House; it should be disbanded when a Secretary of Education is appointed, or made to report either to him or to a National Education Foundation.

8. Low-interest loan programs for construction of income-producing college and university buildings should be expanded, with matching grants offered to build non-income-producing buildings. Low-interest loans should be given to any college or university not accepting federal monies for academic facilities.

9. Federal government programs of fellowships, especially at graduate level, should be expanded with costs-of-education supplements offered to the college.

10. The federal government program of student loans should be expanded.

Costs:

Assuming enrollments will double; annual expenditures, including capital outlays of colleges and universities, will rise to $11.1 billion by 1970 (in 1960 dollars). For public institutions, the money will come chiefly from state and local governments. For private institutions, the chief money sources will be tuition, endowment income and gifts.

(7) Name: Educational Frontiers

Date: 1961

By: President's Task Force Committee on Education

A 5-man team of advisors appointed by President Kennedy

Recommendations:

*1. Thirty dollars per pupil per annum should be given to local districts in each state for use in salaries, construction or other purposes for improving education.

*2. Twenty dollars per child should be given to states with personal income per student in average daily public school attendance that is below 70% of the national average.

*3. Twenty dollars per child in average daily public school attendance should be given to the great cities facing grave educational crises.

4. Loans and grants should be provided of at least $500 million for first year for academic facilities.

5. The loan authorization for student housing should be increased by an annual 30%.

6. The national fellowship program to attract teachers into elementary and secondary schools and to encourage in-service effectiveness should be increased.

7. NDEA loan funds should be increased and forgiveness extended to all teachers. Student disclaimer affidavit should be eliminated.

*8. Construction of education television networks should be supported.

9. A President's Advisory Committee on Education should be established.

10. The President should request all federal agencies to support and implement recommendation of the President's Science Advisory Committee issued November 15, 1969.

Costs:

Program	Annual Costs
Aid to states for general improvements	$1.2 billion

Aid to states below national average	$140 million
Academic facilities, loans, and grants	$500 million minimum
Student housing loans	30% annual increase

(8) Name: Report of the President's Task Force on Education

Date: November, 1964

By: A 13-member Task Force appointed by President Johnson. John Gardner, Chairman.

Conclusions:

The need to resolve the problem of educating the disadvantaged is great.

A balanced federal-state-local relationship is of prime importance.

State, local and private efforts must continue to be predominant, although federal aid must play a large part.

Technical and vocational education needs improvement and expansion.

Federal support for industry-operated schools must be considered.

The colleges' and universities' commitment to lifelong education is overdue.

Improvements and innovation in education are at least as important as national defense.

Tax credits should not be granted as a means of financing higher education.

Financial problems are worse for elementary and secondary schools than for colleges and universities.

Recommendations:

*1. Legislation should be adopted to establish university extension programs.

*2. Legislation should be adopted to provide matching grants to create supplementary educational centers within local school systems and communities.

*3. A nationwide network of large-scale National Educational Laboratories, for research and methodology connected with universities should be established.

*4. Grants-in-aid to needy, able students should be afforded.

5. Work-study programs should be expanded.

6. Loans and loan guaranties should be more widely used.

7. Studies in humanities require greater financial support.

8. A college development program of grants to colleges affiliating for the sake of strength should be established.

9. A Program of National Teaching Fellows--a domestic Peace Corps for helping relieve teacher shortage--should be adopted.

10. An independent Office of Education at Presidential level (like the Office of Economic Opportunity) should coordinate old and new programs and develop federal government policy.

11. A Council of Educational Advisors should review programs, identify needs, and set goals.

12. A committee of laymen should study federal-state-local relations in education and explore the feasibility of a permanent Interstate Commission on Education, under the jurisdiction of the states, as a forum and study center.

*13. Grants should be given to strengthen state departments of education.

*14. Greater state efforts for teaching the handicapped are called for.

15. Greater funding for the Educational Opportunity Act is needed.

16. Money is needed to better select and provide services for non-government sponsored foreign students.

17. Funds are required for better coordination of the federal agencies' internal activities and to better use college and university resources in conducting international educational activities.

*18. Consideration should be given to federal government-sponsored educational field offices overseas.

19. State educational machinery should receive increased support.

20. General federal aid to public schools, with an equalization formula, should be granted.

Program	Initial Annual Cost
Supplementary Education Centers	$1 billion
Community extension	$50 million minimum (without matching requirements).
National Educational Laboratories and graduate level teacher-preparation fellowships	$50 million ($250 million after five years).
Student aid programs, upgrading graduate education, college development program, national teaching fellows	$350 million(eventually reaching $1 billion)
International education	double present funds.
Grants to improve states' educational machinery	$75 million.
General aid to public schools	$1 billion maximum

(9) Name: White House Conference on Education: A Milestone for Educational Progress

Date: August, 1965

By: A report prepared for the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate. It includes the summary reports of eighteen consultants in nine discussion areas. (The conference did not act as a group in dealing with the subjects under discussion).

Conclusions:

There will be relative and absolute declines in unskilled and semi-skilled blue collar jobs; a probable slow-up in white-collar jobs where computers are usable; growth in professional and technical workers; a possibly growing gap between jobs available and workers available.

A person needs 14 years of education to compete with machines. Schools are producing annually one million unemployables.

We need certain kinds of information we do not have in order to make long-range policy and commit huge sumsof money.

The allocation of resources between the public and private sector is of primary importance to policy; scholarship aid, instead of institutional support, would switch growth from the public to private sector of higher education.

Negro education is grossly inferior to white education.

Very few innovations have moved into the mainstream of American education.

Federal aid in some form will continue, probably grow. The states are,and should continue to be, the senior partners in the federal-state relationship.

Serious deficiencies in schools will have increasingly serious consequences for productivity of economy and social stability.

School must meet needs of a significant disadvantaged minority.

Total revision of high school methodologies and curricula as well as restoration of accent on individual capacity is long overdue.

*The United States Office of Education is probably the only public educational agency able to conduct a national periodic assessment of American education.

*There is a desperate need for a national policy regarding education's big problems and a detailed, prior, state-by-state study of American education.

The responsibility for higher education is primarily the states'.

If the present pattern continues, private higher educational institutions will become heavily undergraduate and public colleges and universities will have to account for the necessary diversity in programs and levels of education offered.

The trend is for the better-supported colleges and universities to get richer, the poorer to get poorer.

Teachers and students dismally lack world perspective.

Educating the talented is a sound educational policy.

A basic problem in higher education is how to encourage federal leadership without establishing federal control.

Federal policy in higher education is the sum of the programs the federal government supports -- i. e. , not a coherent whole. The pragmatic principle is not a sound basis for making policy.

(10) Name: Report of the Task Force on Education

Date: June, 1967

By: The President's Task Force on Education

A 13-member Task Force appointed by the President; all educators. William Friday, Chairman.

Goals:

- To provide equal opportunity for quality education.
- To reverse the trend towards separate schools for rich, middle class and poor.
- To reduce adult illiteracy substantially.
- To provide incentives for states to upgrade education.
- To develop vocational training programs for those with educational and social handicaps.
- To provide special educational aid for rural youth.
- To expand and improve federal programs for education of the poor.
- To expand and improve aid for constructing school facilities.
- To join city and suburb in educating the disadvantaged.
- To improve all colleges and universities.
- To expand all higher education institutions to accommodate increased enrollment.
- To strengthen and give high priority to graduate education, research, and scholarship.

Conclusions:

Poor children are at a severe educational disadvantage.

Much more integration is needed at all levels.

The federal government should provide incentives.

The quality of undergraduate instruction needs improvement.

The quality of education in public education and in several hundred private liberal arts schools is not nearly good enough.

Colleges and universities have a responsibility to contribute their skills and knowledge to dealing with the problems of the community.

State departments of education traditionally have given too much attention to rural education, too little to urban education.

Education is likely to become an ever more expensive sector of the economy.

Higher education is headed for greater financial difficulties.

Enrollment burdens will fall most heavily on public colleges and universities.

Recommendations:

1. Title I of the ESEA Act should be employed to improve the education of poor children. Appropriations should be doubled over the next two fiscal years, and thereafter increased more rapidly, but with a revised formula to focus money where most needed. Well-to-do districts should receive Title I aid if they educate poor children. There should be additional incentives for mixing of middle and low income children in schools.

*2. The federal government should encourage states to change their aid formulas to equalize aid to school districts with concentrations of poor children and educational problems.

3. Early Schooling should be given priority under Title I.

*4. The federal government should undertake a "moon shot" effort to improve the instruction of poor children by increasing research on curricula, teaching, and school administration; and by supporting centers to test and demonstrate new ideas -- ranging from a center for reading to a center offering a totally new learning environment for students and their families.

5. The Teacher Corps should be strengthened.

6. Basic illiteracy should be reduced within the next five years, and programs stepped up to give adults a high school education.

7. Vocational educators should establish special training programs (including "real-life" training) for out-of-school youth.

*8. The Metropolitan School Program should establish major new construction and operating grant program to encourage school districts in cities and suburbs to cooperate in the development of quality schooling to serve a mixture of races and income classes. Twenty-five million dollars should be set aside for each of 50 largest metropolitan areas to carry out a locally developed plan. Supplementary grants should be made to existing schools to enable them to change the mix of their enrollments or to maintain favorable mixes. An all-environment program to maintain or institute a favorable racial-economic mix in the schools should be demonstrated in 5 major metropolitan areas, combining federal resources here recommended with those in model cities, urban renewal, and other programs.

*9. Consideration should be given to extending the "metropolitan" school concept to a "regional" school concept to provide comparable education in rural areas.

10. Special instructional measures should be given priority under "moon shot" proposal to metropolitan school programs.

11. Title III (Supplementary Centers) of the ESEA should be used more widely to solve crucial urban problems.

12. Integrated schools in the Model Cities Program should be encouraged.

13. Grants should be made to States for teacher training and to universities to advance the professional standing of teachers.

*14. School administration should receive greater attention through programs to attract young people to prepare for school administration; offer challenging, high quality, mid-career opportunities for school executives; and to encourage communities to institute efficient school management.

15. Teachers and school administrators should be free to move to school systems where their talents are most needed.

*16. General aid should, in the future, be considered as a much-needed, inevitable way to equalize opportunity and to shift the financial burden onto the federal income tax base.

*17. A four-part federal program of basic educational aid should be developed for facilities construction, research and scholarship, graduate education, and experimentation, as follows:

- Facilities: Expand dollar levels, increase federal matching, and provide academic facilities to meet quality objectives (as well as enrollment increases).
- Research and scholarship: Expand federal support; promote new and expanded high quality graduate programs; pay full costs of federally supported research; and establish a Social Science Foundation.
- Graduate Education: Increase percentage of federally supported graduate students to 50%; and raise cost of education allowances to $3, 500 per student.
- Experimental basic aid: Provide unrestricted grants equal to 10% of instructional costs plus $100 for each student.

*18. Undergraduate instruction should be improved as follows:

- Offer undergraduate faculty a chance to do research.
- Give central administrations funds to stimulate innovation in teaching and curricula.
- Make project grants for developing better college curricula for general use.
- Establish a selected number of university centers for research and development in undergraduate instruction.
- Establish supplementary centers and programs to encourage innovations in curriculum and instruction.

- Establish undergraduate teaching professorships.

- Increase support for international education.

*19. The developing colleges program should place emphasis on linking predominantly Negro colleges with predominantly white colleges; and on encouraging the construction and use of joint facilities, programs, and staff.

*20. Existing programs (work-training, work-study, scholarships, student loans and guarantees) should be expanded. Low-income students should be prepared for college by helping them make commitments in the first years of high school, by experimenting with a free freshmen year and by assisting schools to develop special compensatory programs.

*21. Compensatory services should be offered to enable minority youth to participate effectively in school.

*22. The community service role of higher education should be strengthened by increasing funds for present programs, and by special funding of those programs showing the greatest promise.

23. Elementary and secondary schools should be helped to establish new teacher education centers; to encourage teachers colleges to associate with a regional laboratory or a major university; and to expand their Master of Arts in Teaching programs.

24. Educational research should be increased in the areas of curriculum, learning, and teaching.

25. Federal planning and evaluation should be strengthened, in order to develop a capability to plan the overall federal programs in education, and to conduct periodic evaluations of new federal programs.

26. State planning and evaluation for elementary and secondary schools should be strengthened. A single state plan for elementary and secondary education should replace separate plans.

27. The capability of local elementary and secondary schools to develop and evaluate programs and plans should be strengthened, and role of the local school board in the development of educational policies expanded.

28. Those in programs of higher education planning and evaluation should carefully assess existing programs and plans before taking further steps.

29. Education should be given greater rank and status in the federal government.

30. A high level group should be appointed to study the organization of federal educational programs.

*31. Problems arising from federal red tape should be minimized by making federal grants a year ahead of their actual use; sending federal checks on time; and consolidating regulations pertaining to federal programs.

Grant recipients should be adequately reimbursed for administrative expenses.

32. New federal programs should include initial grants for planning purposes.

	Costs		
Program	1968 (base)	1969 (additional)	1971 (Task Force Recommendation)
Elementary and Secondary Education	$1540*	$1322	$4991
Higher Education	3294	2307	4074
Planning and Procedures	20	0	60
	$4854	$3629	$9125

* in billions

(11) Name: The Federal Financing of Higher Education

Date: April, 1968

By: The Association of American Universities

Conclusions:

Federal aid must go to both public and private institutions.

Equal access and the highest possible educational attainment are fundamental principles.

The success of national effort on almost any front depends to a large extent on the manpower and knowledge developed in colleges and universities.

Greater federal aid should be a supplement to, not a substitute for, other sources of income for higher education.

By 1975, there will be 8 million students enrolled in higher education. A $15 billion annual budget will be needed, plus about $1.5 billion annually for construction.

The federal government has a special interest in graduate and professional education.

Recommendations:

1. Student aid, especially for disadvantaged, and loan programs should be expanded.

2. Additional graduate fellowships and traineeships, and increased cost-of-education supplements to federal fellowships should be provided.

*3. A greater share of capital construction funds should come from the federal government, (from 1/3 to 2/3 or more).

4. Research support and grants to institutions should increase.

*5. There should be more research on libraries, computers and international studies.

6. New funding should commence for university "action" programs.

*7. A new system of broadly based institutional support for colleges and universities as a necessary supplement to current sources of support should be undertaken.

(12) Name: Report of the Advisory Committee on Higher Education to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare

Date: July 1, 1968

By: The Advisory Committee on Higher Education

A 13-member group appointed in April, 1967 by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. Members represented higher education, state government, foundations. W. Clarke Wescoe, Chairman.

Goals:

- To ensure higher education facilities, adequate in quality, quantity, and variety to meet the society's needs for teaching, research and public service.
- To ensure equal access to higher education, including the removal of financial barriers and the operation of compensatory programs.
- To enhance the intellectual and cultural quality of American life by supporting those aspects of higher education leading to a fuller life for all U.S. citizens.

Conclusions:

The federal government is primarily responsible for the destiny of higher education.

The absence of clear goals and comprehensive policies on the part of the federal government has done considerable damage in academic development, institutional integrity, administration and financing of higher education.

The development of such clear goals and comprehensive policies is now a national imperative.

State and local contributions are close to their farthest limit.

If the federal goal is to remove financial barriers to a higher education, it should pay the full costs of programs to achieve that goal and reimburse institutions for cost increases incurred thereby.

There is a need for an effective system of communication between higher educational institutions and the federal government.

Education has become the chief determinant of a person's social position.

Federal funds support research, aid to students, growth and modernization of higher education, and the arts and humanities.

The drawbacks of federal support include a grossly uneven distribution of support; a lack of government awareness of impact of federal funding on individual institutions; a distortion of academic balance; an undue emphasis on innovation; and many unreasonable administrative regulations.

There is a lack of federal support for instructional costs, and for special-purpose institutions.

The federal government has a primary responsibility for higher education, because it is now a national concern. The government is more and more dependent on higher education for services and training; and is the only public body with the scope, authority and money to equalize educational opportunity and strengthen institutions.

Recommendations:

The federal government should:

*1. Stabilize its funding operations.

*2. Sustain excellence and achievement by concentrating on quality institutions and able students.

3. Recognize effective past efforts by institutions.

4. Maintain diversity among institutions and create new points of entry.

*5. Assume special responsibilities for graduate and professional education.

6. Encourage the development of national and regional facilities.

7. Establish reasonable administrative procedures.

8. Encourage additional sources of support for higher education.

9. Revise its matching requirements.

10. Study and plan for future needs.

11. Establish a National Council on Higher Learning in the office of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, to serve as forum, to gather data and promote research, to assess priorities and the adequacy of existing policies, to serve as spokesman and assist in drafting legislation. It should consist of 15 members, appointed by the Secretary of HEW.

12. Strengthen the Federal Interagency Committee on Education to coordinate all federal programs in higher education and to maintain liaison with the National Council.

Costs:

None given

(13) Name: Alternative Methods of Federal Funding for Higher Education

Date: August, 1968

By: Ronald A. Wolk for the Carnegie Commission on the Future of Higher Education

Major Alternative Methods of Financing Higher Education:

1. Categorical Aid. Grants, contracts or loans in support of a special project or goal designated by granting agency, until 1960's, were almost the sole form of federal aid. Land-Grant Act of 1862 and World War II research grants are two of the biggest examples of this kind of aid.

   Research. Some argue that grants for research are not aid, but payment for services. In 1966, colleges and universities paid an estimated $60 million from institutional funds to support federally-sponsored research. Construction aid was begun in 1930's for housing. In 1956 Health Research Facilities Act gave facilities grants; 1963 Higher Education Facilities Act released millions to colleges and universities for facilities on a 2 to 1 matching basis.

2. Student Aid. The GI Bill initiated extensive federal aid to students. The National Defense provided loans and fellowships on a 90-10 (federal government - colleges and universities) basis, with a cost-of-education allowance to the institution for every graduate followship. The Higher Education Act of 1965 gave economic opportunity grants to undergraduates, as well as work-study funds and guaranteed loans.

3. Institutional Grants. These are provided through NDEA, NSF grants, HEA, etc. The term "Institutional grants" is now being used by some to refer to broad, unrestricted support for higher education institutions. Such a form of support is approved within the academic world, but not outside. The latter group claims it would be too little spread too thin, and would too often perpetuate mediocrity.

4. Tax Relief. There are three kinds of tax relief: deductions; exemptions (these give most benefit to those with high incomes);

tax-credit (subtracting expenses from actual tax owed). Proponents for the idea of relief argue that tax credits will offset tuition and fee increases and also help institutions. Opponents say it is too costly, aids the rich, helps the institution more than students, favors private higher education, and puts public funds'control into individuals' hands. Institutional and individual exemptions involve enormous amounts of money. Recent proposals involved shifting part of the financial burden for educational expenses from student and parents to the federal government.

5. Revenue Sharing and Aid to the States. Significant federal aid to states and federal aid to higher education began with the Morrill Act. By 1968, over one-half of federal grants to states were for health, education and welfare.

Tax Sharing. This would give states a designated percentage of the federal tax revenue.

Unconditional Grants. This involves monies for general purposes distributed through a permanent trust fund. Both this and tax sharing maintain state authorities and allow the state to share in the federal tax collected.

Conditional Grants. Made for specific purposes, they would preserve federal power but would be an effective "equalizer" of educational opportunity throughout all states.

Revenue Sharing. Some see it as a path to creative federalism, a builder of state power and a solution to state problems. Others oppose it because they think states operate inefficiently and without a solid tax base. They fear the states' misuse of the revenue received.

(14) Name: Quality and Equality: New Levels of Federal Responsibility for Higher Education

Date: December, 1968

By: Carnegie Commission on the Future of Higher Education

A commission of 15 members created in early 1967 by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Clark Kerr, Chairman.

Goals:

- To retain and improve the academic quality of higher educational institutions.
- To effect equality of access to higher education.
- To provide student aid to assure that financial barriers do not prevent or shorten pursuit of higher education.
- To provide funds for institutional expansion.
- To encourage graduate training of professional personnel, especially medical.
- To support the most talented Ph. D. candidates and the institutions that train them.
- To continue supporting university research.
- To support new curricular directions and new educational techniques.

Conclusions:

Equality of opportunity is increasingly related to equality of access to education.

The economy is dependent on basic research, advancing technology and higher skills.

Social complexity requires more managers, teachers and professionals, particularly health personnel.

Higher education's cultural contributions help America to be aware of the problem of the quality of life.

Yearly higher education enrollment will grow by 1976 to 8 million. Its functions will continue to grow and develop. By 1976, higher education will cost $41 billion a year.

The private sector cannot be expected substantially to increase its contribution to higher education.

Much greater federal support of all higher education is required. It should:

- Elicit rather than replace state and private support.
- Allow for periodic re-evaluation and re-allocation.
- Help both public and private institutions.
- Improve educational opportunity for all.
- Allow free student choice of institution and field of study.
- Preserve institutional autonomy and diversity.
- Encourage innovation.
- Help distinguished institutions maintain premium for quality.
- Use the competitive principle to support academic quality.

Recommendations:

*1. The present program of educational opportunity grants should be strengthened and expanded based on need. The funds should be increased so that all college students with demonstrated need are assured of some financial aid.

Grants should be available for no more than four undergraduate years and two graduate years. In case of full need, grants should be awarded in the amounts of $750 per year for freshman and sophomores, $1000 per year for juniors and seniors, $1000 per year for first and second-year graduate students.

2. An undergraduate student holding an educational opportunity grant and receiving added grants from non-federal sources should be provided with a supplementary federal grant in an amount matching the non-federal grants but not exceeding one-half of the student's educational opportunity grant.

3. Each college and university should be given a scholarship fund for needy students equal to 10% of the total sum of educational opportunity grants held by students at that institution.

4. Colleges and universities should be provided with funds to operate work-study programs for undergraduates who meet in general terms the federal criteria, with provisions for enabling them to earn up to $500 per year, and for encouraging off-campus assignments of educational value.

*5. The present federal aid program of guidance, counseling, and testing for identification and encouragement of able students should expand to include research activities to develop better ways to identify qualified students; federal training courses for high school teachers and counselors; and information centers in metropolitan areas.

6. Selected universities should undertake specific graduate talent search and development programs.

*7. A doctoral fellowship program should provide $3000 annually for no more than 2 years to students advanced to the Ph. D. or other research doctorate candidacy. The total number of such first-year fellowships should equal three-fourths of all earned U. S. doctorates in the previous year.

*8. A federal contingent loan program should be established, so that undergraduates could borrow up to $2500 per year, graduates up to $3500 per year. The program would be administered through the institutions; need would not be a condition of eligibility. This program would offset inadequacies of the NDEA and Guaranteed Loans Program.

A loan program with a contingent repayment provision has the following advantages over a fixed-contract loan:

- Those with highest posteducation incomes would help pay the cost of educating those whose incomes were lower.
- Prospect of repayment would be a lesser deterrent to assuming the loan.

- Student would be more independent because he could pay a larger part of his education through a loan.

- The counterarguments - i. e. that such a program would attract mostly applicants from lower income groups and discourage women from taking loans - are claimed to be manageable.

*9. Cost-of-education supplements should be given to colleges and universities based on the numbers and levels of students holding federal grants enrolled in the institutions. The institution should use part of these to give special attention to educational needs of the increased number of educationally disadvantaged students.

*10. A program should be established of substantial federal aid for medical education and health services to expand existing medical schools; to create new medical schools; to train medical care support personnel; and to increase quantity and quality of health care.

The goals should be accomplished by means of student aid to medical students; construction funds; start-up, non-construction grants; and program support.

*11. Construction grants should be increased from the present 2/5 and 1/3 provisions to 1/2 total amounts required to construct, renovate, or replace facilities. Start-up, non-construction grants should be provided for new community colleges and urban institutions. Academic facilities construction loan program funds should be increased to cover an additional 25% of needed new construction costs.

12. Funds for university and college research in next few years should be expanded, but with annual rate of increase declining from 15% in 1970-71 to 10% in 1976-77.

*13. Grants amounting to 10% of the total research grants received annually by an institution should be given to that institution, to be used at its sole discretion.

14. Funding for developing institutions, library support, and international studies should be enlarged.

15. A National Foundation for the Development of Higher Education, operating under direction of a board and organized like NSF, should fund short-run, developmental programs; encourage, advise, review, and finance institutional programs showing new directions in curricula, strengthening essential areas, improving techniques, etc.

16. A Council of Advisors on Higher Education should be appointed, to be attached to the White House. (The Commission rejected tax credits to parents of children in college because they would not aid low-income families; and general subsidies to the several states because they would fail to provide the coordination and perspective necessary to assure expansion of programs of primary national concern.)

Costs:

These new priorities and the expansion of existing programs will cost about $10 billion per year by 1976 (1/7 of expected additional revenues at that time).

1.

1967-68	1976-77
$3.45 billion	$13.22 billion (for present purposes)

2. Expenditures for above recommendations:

1970-71	1976-77
$ 7.03	$12.97
3.03 loan commitments	5.61
$10.06 billion	$18.58 billion

(15) Name: Toward a Long-Range Plan for Federal Financial Support for Higher Education

Date: January, 1969

By: United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation.

In response to request of President made in 1968. Submitted by the Secretary of HEW.

Goals:

- To increase number and proportion of educated people.
- To increase the equality of opportunity for higher education.
- To improve the quality of higher education.
- To preserve diversity in higher education and advance institutional autonomy and academic freedom.
- To strengthen graduate education and institutional research and public service capabilities of higher educational institutions.
- To encourage the efficient use of resources in higher education.

Conclusions:

Federal aid can only be partial. There will continue to be many competing demands on a limited federal budget. Families, business, industry and students must share the financial burden.

The federal government should adopt an explicit, long-range goal of removing financial barriers in order to guarantee higher education to all who can benefit from it.

Motivating pre-college students is every bit as important as helping in-college students.

Institutional autonomy and diversity must be preserved.

Higher education enrollment has risen rapidly, but expenditures have increased even more rapidly.

The federal government has never developed an explicit strategy for the support of higher education.

All types of institutions rely more on federal funds as a result of a relative decrease in endowment earnings and private gifts and grants as revenue sources. In 1965-66, federal funds accounted for 21% of total revenue of higher educational institutions.

Federal aid for undergraduates is far from adequate to insure access to college for all persons capable of acquiring a college education.

Public institutions, rather than private, have experienced a relative decline in revenue per student in the recent past.

Graduate education has an imbalance in administrative and institutional arrangements, in the relationship among fields of study, and in institutional patterns.

There is a significant loss of academically able students from lower income families.

Excluded from this study were the following:

- Consideration of specialized types of manpower or need for particular kinds of professional training.
- Assessment of present quality of higher education.
- Consideration of desirable level of federal spending for research in higher educational institutions.

Recommendations:

1. An expanded educational opportunity grant program for needy students combined with a cost-of-education allowance to the institution should be provided for all needy full-time undergraduate students in good standing. It should be dispensed through specially-designated agencies directly to institutions. Cost-of-education allowance would be based on the number of such students and on the NDEA Loan Program and College Work-Study Program funds.

2. A National Student Loan Bank, a non-profit private corporation, should be established by the U.S. government to give loans at fixed interest rate, available to both undergraduate and graduate students, with a long-term repayment schedule, and a cancellation schedule for low-income years. Advantages over other proposed or existing loan arrangements would include a longer repayment schedule; possible cancellation if income is low; no repayment required while a student or in military service; and the availability of a bonus at all times.

   A twenty-member Board of Directors would direct this corporation. Congress would choose fifteen members, the President would appoint five public members by and with Senate advice to represent higher education, banking and finance. IRS would collect all repayments.

3. The new programs of special services for disadvantaged students should be fully funded.

4. The National Science Foundation, National Institutes of Health, and Office of Education institutional development grants should be extended to the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. All should be substantially funded, in order to develop new centers of excellence and new areas of study, particularly at the graduate level.

5. The cost-of-education allowances for federal graduate fellowships should be raised. A scheduled review should be introduced for upward adjustment of allowance, in recognition of the higher cost of higher levels of graduate education.

6. NDEA graduate fellowships should be expanded to 30,000 by 1975, (especially in non-science fields) more than double the present number. Still, this figure would equal only 6% of full-time graduate students in 1975.

7. A "sustaining grant" equal to a percentage of federal research awards should be given to higher educational institutions.

*8. Over the next several years, categorical aid programs related to specific items should be consolidated whenever possible and the definition of categories should be broadened. A block grant would provide funds for any or all of the following: construction renovation, facility rental, library resources, buying instructional equipment, planning and evaluating institutional functions and operations. The federal share should be at least half of the total. Long-range institutional plans should be encouraged.

9. The Developing Institutions Program should be fully funded.

10. The Office of Education should establish a project-grant program to support experiments to improve undergraduate teaching and to devise new instructional programs.

The report maintains that student aid is a more effective mechanism for promoting equality of educational opportunity, and institutional aid is a more effective mechanism for rapidly channeling resources per student into the higher education sector of the economy.

Costs:

The federal money required by FY 1976 to implement only these recommendations would be $6. 3 billion. Total federal funds for higher education (excluding research) would rise from $3. 7 to about $11. 2 billion in FY 1976. Including research, an increase from $5. 4 billion in FY 1976 is projected.

(16) Name: Federal Programs for Higher Education

Date: February, 1969

By: American Council on Education

Goals:

- To provide greater access to higher education for an ever larger number and larger percentage of our young people through student aid programs, especially for disadvantaged students, and plant construction aid.
- To increase output of highly trained manpower at graduate and professional level, particularly in health and science.
- To support basic research.
- To support and encourage high quality in education.
- To mobilize and use institutions' intellectual resources in a host of service functions.

Conclusions:

Despite states' efforts, large increases in philanthropy, and drastically increased student charges, financial situation of colleges and universities has steadily deteriorated.

Education is a national asset and a national responsibility; no state or region can be assured that its investment in higher education will give commensurate returns.

When the federal government decides to support a given area of activity, non-federal sources are quick to follow.

Recommendations:

1. In all federal-university relationships, cost-sharing and matching requirements should be eliminated. Maintenance-of-cost requirements should be maintained.
2. Universities should be given a sustained government commitment.

3. The Guaranteed Loan Program, Educational Opportunity Grants, Work-Study, NDEA Loan, Upward Bound, College Housing Loan Programs and the Higher Education Facilities Act should be maintained and improved.

4. Five per cent of the federal government academic research money should be allocated for direct grants to institutions for research in the social sciences, humanities and the arts.

5. Annual increases in number of federal graduate fellowships and traineeships should be resumed.

6. The Improvement of Graduate Programs (Title X, HEA of 1965) should be established.

7. Funds for the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act programs and the AID technical cooperation programs; the International Education Act of 1966; and support programs to train health personnel should be restored and increased.

8. Support for general institutional purposes should be provided, with the formula based largely on undergraduate enrollment.

9. A coordinating council in federal government should be established, to consider all facets of higher education, and to weigh priorities.

Costs:

For construction, $3. 75 billion will be needed by the mid-1970's to close the gap, to be provided through a mix of interest subsidy payments: $1 billion in direct loans for college housing and $1 billion in grants for academic facilities, with the federal share raised from the present 50% to 75%.

(17) Name: Report of the President-elect's Task Force on Education

Date: 1969

By: Task Force on Education appointed by President Nixon
Alan Pifer, Chairman

Conclusions:

The increased federal involvement in recent years is due to: urgent national needs; much greater public awareness of relationship between education and solution of various national problems; inadequacy of state, local and private sources of funds; greatly increased public demand for education either as basic right or a consumption item; and weakness of leadership at state level.

The President must establish his image as "education-minded."

The present federal responsibility for education derives from the General Welfare clause of Constitution, transcending the total of the collective concerns of state, local and private agencies.

The federal government's chief failings in educational matters are inadequate mechanisms for policy formulation, and lack of intra-governmental coordination.

Less than one-third of the annual $12 billion spent by the federal government on education is administered by the Commissioner of Education.

The disorganization of federal effort by default may be said to preserve pluralism.

The post of Assistant Secretary of HEW for Education could be abolished.

Three types of federal aid were summarized as follows:

- General Aid. This consists of lump sums for unspecified purposes to states or institutions; it is being given only to the service academies and Howard University.

- Block Grants. These are funds given or loaned for broadly defined purposes on a formula basis to states or institutions, e.g. through Title I of ESEA.

- Categorical Grants. These are funds given or loaned for specifically defined purposes, with decision as to their purposes reserved to the federal agency.

Arguments against general aid were summarized as follows:

- It would reopen and aggravate the church-state issue.
- It would cause civil rights problems.
- If widely used, it would destroy the capacity for a national approach to urgent problems.
- It would almost certainly increase the cost of education greatly without a commensurate raise in quality.
- It would probably not alleviate special problems of urban education and would aggravate existing problems in the maldistribution of federal education funds.
- Congress would probably not relinquish the political power inherent in block and categorical grants.

Federal aid to individual students, which circumvents the church-state issue, promotes resistance to integregation in some states.

The federal government has a special responsibility to intervene in urban education.

Discontinuous federal funding in support of higher education is irresponsible, especially when federal funds are dominant in an institution's budget.

Tax credit plans favor the well-to-do and are not acceptable.

Recommendations:

1. The position of Commissioner of Education should be upgraded to a Secretaryship over a separate Department of Education.

2. A National Council of Educational Advisors in the Executive Office of the President should be established.

*3. The federal government should move away from categorical grants toward broader "designated block grants."

4. Aid to strengthen state departments of education should be increased.

*5. A new Urban Education Act (as an addition to Title I of ESEA) should give impetus to a concentrated effort on educational improvement in the largest cities.

6. Funds for Educational Opportunity Grants under HEA should be increased.

7. The shortage in loan and grant funds for higher education facilities should be made up.

*8. Colleges and universities should be given funds to provide special assistance to city schools and other urban problems.

9. Research funds should be restored.

10. Headstart should be retained.

11. Indian children in federal schools should be included in all future education legislation.

12. The funding of the Teachers Corps and the other sections of the Education Professions Development Act, and of the Vocational Education Act should be increased.

13. The level of funding of the Fulbright program should be restored to at least the 1967 level of fiscal strength. The International Education Act should be funded in full.

*14. The arts at the elementary and secondary levels, particularly in the inner cities, should receive greater support.

Program	Annual Cost
Urban Education Act	$1 billion
Economic Opportunity Grants	no amount suggested
NDEA Loan and Work-Study	$100 million more
Graduate fellowships and traineeships	no amount suggested
Teachers Corps	$10 million more

Fulbright Program	$15 million more
National Endowment for the Humanities	$13.75 million more

Appendix B

SUMMARY OF THE STATUS OF CURRENT PLANNING AND COORDINATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE 50 STATES*

A. Purpose and Method

The purpose of this report is to survey the present status of planning and coordinating of higher education in each of the fifty states and the District of Columbia. It covers facilities as well as programs.

A copy of the material on each state that appeared in the first (1967) edition of this report was sent to the director of the primary planning agency or of the facilities planning agency with a request that it be coorected, updated, and augmented. In addition, the agency received a questionnaire requesting supplementary information. Copies of recent master plans and/or the relevant planning documents of all planning bodies concerned with higher education were requested. Similar requests were addressed to regional associations.

Questionnaires on the planning procedures for student financial assistance were sent to each state authority concerned with this field; others on post-secondary vocational-technical education to each State Director of Vocational-Technical Education.

The information thus collected was written up and sent back to an official state agency for final review and approval. The section on each state therefore reflects the view of the statewide coordinating or facilities body as to planning for higher education in the state. Some state agencies which have a role in planning for higher education may have been omitted from this study inasmuch as only those listed in the material returned by the approving agency were included in this report.

---

*This Appendix will appear as the introduction to "State Planning for Higher Education," prepared by the Academy for Educational Development. It may be ordered at $3.00 per copy from AED, 1424 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

The following questions are discussed:

(a) How does the state provide for overall planning for higher education and how is it coördinated? How is planning coordinated for public senior institutions? Two-year institutions? Post-secondary vocational-technical education? Does the state make special arrangements applicable to planning or coordination in private institutions of higher education? If so, what mechanisms are employed?

(b) If a statewide planning agency for higher education has been established, does it also have governing authority? Is the same agency responsible for medical education planning? student financial aid programs? administration of federal titles relating to facilities? post-secondary vocational-technical education?

(c) What other public or private agencies are concerned with statewide planning for higher education? What are their functions in this respect?

(d) Does the state have a completed master plan? Is a master plan in process of completion? scheduled for future development?

(e) What role do regional associations play in higher education planning? National associations?

B. Summary of Findings

1. Individual Institutions

Most individual institutions are responsible for developing their own plans.

2. Coordination of Planning

The difficulty of coordinating the multiple activities of the numerous state agencies involved in the many facets of higher education is suggested by the fact that this study identified more than 300 agencies, other than individual institutions, with some responsibility for higher education.

In many states, decisions on the development of higher education are inherent in the budgeting process which requires review and analysis of budget requests by various state agencies and legislative committees or departments. A number of other state agencies have governing or line relationships to the educational institutions, and some are related to them through coordinating, advisory, or staff functions.

In addition, compliance with the requirements of federal programs in aid of higher education has resulted in the proliferation of federally-supported state agencies (facilities commissions, vocational-technical boards, scholarship/fellowship committees, etc.).

3. Official Coordinating and Governing Agencies (Table I)

Most state governments recognize the need for systematic planning for higher education; an increasing number of states have interposed publicly financed special agencies between the individual institutions and the mushrooming group of state agencies. Statutory or constitutional agencies have been established in 40 states to coordinate overall planning for higher education.

Seventeen of these 40 agencies also govern and regulate public institutions of higher education. The State Board of Education has legal authority for the general supervision of higher education in Florida, Idaho, Michigan, Montana, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania and Rhode Island. Divisions within the board are responsible for overall planning and coordination. In Oregon, a coordinating agency has been superimposed over the statewide governing board. In Arizona and Idaho the agency's governing authority extends only to senior institutions.

The 23 agencies which do not have governing power exercise varying degrees of control over planning and coordination. Some statewide planning boards or commissions have only advisory or planning functions. Others review and coordinate academic, facilities, and financial planning. A few, vested by statute with policy-making and sometimes operational powers, define the functions of state-supported institutions, approve new degree programs, approve establishment of new institutions, etc.

Among the 10 states and the District of Columbia which have no formal statewide coordinating or planning agency, a few have advisory bodies with limited functions; Indiana has voluntary arrangements. In four states (Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Mississippi) which report having no overall agency, there is a governing board to administer and coordinate all senior public institutions.

4. Information Obtained on Functions of Official Statewide Planning Agencies (Table II)

   a. Private Institutions: In 14 states the official planning agency is charged with some responsibility for private institutions in overall planning for higher education.

      The law stipulates in three of the 14 states that private institutions must be included in agency planning activity. However, participation by the institutions is voluntary. Four states require representation from the private sector on the membership of the official agency and in five the agencies have authority to review planning and approve program and degree changes for private as well as public institutions. The Kentucky Council on Public Higher Education serves as a central statistical and facilities-planning agency for both public and private institutions. In Oklahoma, private institutions may apply for affiliation with the official agency.

Private institutions participate in the benefits of state-coordinated federal programs, and representation of the private sector on advisory committees of the administering agency is required. Some 15 additional official state agencies indicate a degree of recognition of the private institutions in their statewide planning activities, but for the most part interchange between the public and private sectors is still very limited.

b. Medical Education Planning: The official agency coordinates medical education planning in 28 states.

c. Administration of Federal Titles Relating to Facilities: The primary state planning agency also administers federal titles relating to facilities in 19 states.

Three states have assigned this function to other existing state agencies, but in the remaining 28 states and the District of Columbia special agencies have been established to administer the federal facilities titles. Fifteen primary agencies reported having only a planning function for facilities.

d. Planning and Administration of Student Financial Aid Programs: Student financial aid programs are administered by the official agency in 12 states; it is responsible for some programs in seven others. Coordinating the planning for student financial assistance distributed by several agencies is a function of the official agency in 12 additional instances.

e. Post-secondary Vocational-Technical Education: The official planning agency has some responsibility for planning of post-secondary vocational-technical education in 21 states.

5. Master Plans (Table III)

Most states are developing master plans. Twenty-three states have completed master plans or planning documents which serve as a guideline for statewide planning. Eight more states are in the process of completing master plans, and seven others expect to develop such plans. Of the 12 states (and District of Columbia) which indicate no interest in master plan development, Connecticut and Washington have no mandate for one but overall planning activity is continous.

6. Associations

The associations included in this report have direct concern with long-range planning for higher education. Although material was collected on the activities of accrediting associations as well, the decision was made to omit them since their planning service is usually provided only through their accreditation activities.

The associations serve member states as catalysts for action and consultants for continuous planning. They are working to develop cooperative programs and systematic communication among the state agencies which plan for higher education. Each has an interest in the role, functions, and responsibilities of state education agencies in improving higher education. A major activity is the gathering, interpretation, and dissemination of data to improve planning.

Appendix C

STUDY METHODOLOGY

The Academy for Educational Development, in carrying out its assignment, gave top priority to establishing liaison with members of the higher education community in institutions, government agencies, associations, foundations, and other organizations.

The Academy for Educational Development, in carrying out this study, focused its efforts on:

- Soliciting the views of leaders in higher education as to the major issues and problems with which national planning must be concerned.

- Gaining the support of key leaders of higher education in government, institutions, foundations, associations, and elsewhere for the purpose of the study, in order to explore with them the potential for some kind of national planning effort.

- Appraising the capabilities for planning, and for research related to planning, of higher-education institutions, government agencies, research centers, etc.

- Evaluating the many proposals made in recent years to strengthen the national position of higher education.

To accomplish these purposes, the Academy engaged in the following activities (see Appendix D for an itemized listing of meetings and memoranda):

1. Conducted a series of special meetings in Washington, D. C., New York City, Denver, and Pittsburgh to brief the nation's leaders of higher education, including the heads of major institutions; the leaders of key organizations, societies, and associations; government officials; and others.

2. Recruited, briefed and trained a temporary staff of professional, technical, and clerical personnel to carry out various assignments including the conducting of seminars, the preparation of reports, the interviewing of key officials, the preparation and conducting of surveys, the development of materials, etc.

3. Organized and conducted some 70 seminars throughout the country for presidents, deans, and other key officials of the nation's colleges and universities. These seminars, the first of their kind ever held in the country, were devoted to the identification and discussion of the major issues requiring planning in higher education and of the

possible models for national planning agencies.

Seminars were organized separately for:

a. Private two- and four-year colleges and private universities, to which all institutions were invited.

b. State colleges and universities, to which all institutions were invited.

c. Land-grant colleges and universities, to which all institutions were invited.

d. Public community and junior colleges, to which a selected group was invited.

e. A selected joint group drawn from those who had attended an earlier seminar within one of the above separate categories.

4. Recorded, summarized and evaluated the various seminars.

5. Participated in a USOE-sponsored two-day research conference for the Future of Higher Education held in Washington, D.C., December 2 and 3, 1968.

6. Conducted a number of meetings with heads of state higher education coordinating agencies, governing boards

and councils concerning the problems of the states in planning and their possible future relationship to national planning activities.

7. Contacted and interviewed the key officials concerned with programs for higher education in major federal agencies, obtaining from these various agencies, where appropriate, copies of planning documents and reactions to the idea of and procedures for a national planning activity for higher education.

8. Solicited ideas on national planning from leaders of the group of college and university students that was assembled in mid-May 1969, by the U.S. Office of Education to discuss student involvement in USOE programs.

9. Assembled the necessary data and produced a comprehensive document describing for each of the fifty states the duties, functions, and responsibilities of the various agencies in each state which have overall planning responsibilities for higher education and of such additional agencies as may be responsible for student assistance, vocational education, facilities construction, etc. Each of the states provided the complete data as well as copies

of any plans which may have been developed. (See Appendix B for a summary of this report).

10. Requested, collected and assembled from many of the nation's colleges and universities and from the various states samples of planning reports and activities, information about personnel responsibilities for planning, and copies of actual planning documents.

11. Appraised the work of the major research and planning centers in the nation concerned with the future of higher education; interviewed their staffs with respect to planning-related activities in process or contemplated.

12. Assembled a list of topics requiring further study or research which have emerged from the seminars and contacts with a great many people and agencies around the country who are concerned with the future of higher education.

13. Collected and analyzed reports, professional articles and statements concerning the establishment of various types of agencies at the national or federal level for planning and/or policy development in the area of higher education.

14. Collected and analyzed the key recommendations concerning higher education contained in various major reports. (See Appendix A).

15. Collected and analyzed for use as general background, various governmental and institutional reports, models, papers, and statements relative to the planning of higher education in the nation in the years ahead.

16. Reviewed various proposed models for general federal support for higher education and recruited a group of economists to provide advice to the project.

17. Prepared for the nation's governors, at the behest of the Education Commission of the States, a report on various recommended agencies for national planning; briefed the Steering Committee of the Education Commission of the States on this project and the various proposed agencies.

18. Provided oral progress reports on November 4, 1968 to Drs. Molnar and Neudling, to Drs. Neudling, Koenig, et al, on March 7, 1969, to Drs. Pollen, Neudling and Koenig on May 14, 1969 and on June 2, 1969.

19. Prepared an Interim Report on the Academy's findings, entitled "Toward An Agenda For A National Planning Effort In Higher Education", which was submitted on June 30, 1969.

Appendix D

INDEX OF EXHIBITS AND SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS
(On File in Academy Offices)

Field Work -- Including reports of seminars, special meetings and briefings, interviews, and related research activities.

1. Summary Report of Seminars: How Two- and Four-Year Private Colleges and Universities View Planning.
(Albert E. Holland)

2. Summary Report of Seminars: How State Colleges View Planning.
(Eugene H. Kleinpell)

3. Summary Report of Seminars: How State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges View Planning.
(Paul G. Bulger)

4. Summary Report of Seminars: How Community Colleges View Planning.
(James L. Wattenbarger)

5. Summary Report of Meetings, Interviews, and Related Correspondence: The Views on Planning of Executive Officers of Statewide Coordinating Agencies for Higher Education.
(Lawrence E. Dennis)

6. Summary Report of Meetings, Interviews, and Related Research: Present Education-related Planning Activities within Federal Agencies, and the Views of Key Federal Officials as to Present and Future Planning Needs.
(Roger D. Semerad)

7. Summary Report of Surveys, Interviews, and Meetings within the Research Community: A Survey of Research and Perspectives on National Planning for Higher Education.
(Lyman A. Glenny, Leland L. Medsker, Ernest G. Palola, James G. Paltridge)

8. Summary Report of Meeting and Related Papers: How Leading Economists View National Planning for Education.
   (James Douglas Brown, Jr.)

9. A Summary of Current State Planning Arrangements for Higher Education (for each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia).
   (Louise Abrahams)

10. Summary Report on Meeting and Related Correspondence: The Need for Planning as Expressed by Members of the Federation of State Associations of Independent Colleges and Universities.
    (Rexford G. Moon, Jr.)

11. Briefing for the Steering Committee, Education Commission of the States.
    (Rexford G. Moon, Jr.)

12. Various Summary Reports: Meetings and Briefings with Education Association Members, Key Government Officials, National Higher-education Leaders.
    (Academy Staff)

Consultant and Staff Memoranda

1. A Summary of Various Proposals for a National Higher-Education Planning Agency.
   (Rexford G. Moon, Jr.)

2. Major Problems Facing Public Schools in the Seventies.
   (Sidney G. Tickton and Ronald Gross)

3. Managing the Future: Some Practical Suggestions.
   (Alvin C. Eurich)

4. Current Techniques in College and University Planning.
   (Juan A. Casasco)

5. Areas of Needed Research Into National Planning for Higher Education.
   (Barry W. Schwenkmeyer)

6. Major Issues to be Faced in Planning the Future of Higher Education.
   (Harvie Branscomb)

7. A Consideration of Faculty Workload Policies at Twelve Liberal Arts Colleges.
   (Barry W. Schwenkmeyer)

8. A Summary of Major Reports on Education, from 1929 to 1969.
   (Jerome E. Lord)

9. Major Issues in Federal Aid to Higher Education: Some Unanswered Questions.
   (John P. Mallan)

10. A Proposed Conference Agenda on Major Issues in Federal Aid to Higher Education.
    (John P. Mallan)

11. Thoughts on National Planning for Higher Education.
    (Alice M. Rivlin)

12. Economic Planning for Higher Education.
    (Robert Haveman)

13. A Consideration of Some Major Issues in Educational Planning.
    (William J. Baumol)

14. The Economist's Point of View on National Planning for Education.
    (William G. Bowen)

15. Long-Range Planning: An Essential in College Administration.
    (Chester M. Alter)

16. Some Major Issues to be Considered in National Planning for Education.
    (Chester M. Alter)

17. An Agenda for National Planning and Policy Development in Higher Education.
    (Academy Staff)

18. A Compilation and Review of Various Proposals, Task Force Reports, National Commission Recommendations, and Related Documents.
    (Barry W. Schwenkmeyer)

19. Interim Report: Toward An Agenda for a National Planning Effort in Higher Education.
    (Academy Staff)

20. A Comparison of Six Programs of Federal Support to Education Analyzed by the American Council on Education.
    (James Douglas Brown, Jr.)

21. Interview with Sir John Wolfenden and Professor John Vasey: The System of Government Support of Higher Education in England.
    (James Douglas Brown, Jr.)

22. Factors to be Considered in the Study of Federal Aid to Higher Education.
    (James Douglas Brown, Jr.)

23. College and University Planning: Report on a Joint Study by Colgate University and the American Foundation for Management Research.
    (Robert G. Smith)

Supporting Documents and Reports

1. Summary reports for each of the 70 seminars held for college and university presidents and chief planning officers.

2. Summaries of each interview held with members of federal agencies concerned with education and planning.

3. List of institutions surveyed among the national research community.

4. Records of meetings and related correspondence with executive officers of statewide coordinating agencies for higher education.

5. Statements on planning from 18 states in the Federation of State Associations of Independent Colleges and Universities.

6. Planning documents and statements received from colleges and universities.

7. Plans and planning statements received from state agencies concerned with higher-education planning.

8. Plans and planning-related documents from regional higher education organizations.

9. A proposed Education Act.

10. Collection of articles, printed reports and research documents related to planning.

11. Acts, bills, and related legislative proposals related to educational planning.

12. Reports on educational planning activities from various foreign countries, and from international organizations.

13. Policy statements by various agencies and associations on planning and on the federal role in higher education.

14. A Study of Adult Education in the United States.
(A. A. Liveright)

15. Continuing Education in Institutions of Higher Education: An Overview of the Present and a Look at the Future (in preparation)
(A.A. Liveright and David L. Mosconi)

16. The Expansion of Graduate and Professional Education During the Period 1966 to 1980.
(Alvin C. Eurich, Lucien B. Kinney, and Sidney G. Tickton)

17. Staff work for U.S. Commissioner of Education: Toward Universal Opportunity for Post-Secondary Education.
(Academy Staff)

18. Staff work for U.S. Commissioner of Education: Those Who Serve Education: An Overview of the Education Professions.
(Academy Staff)

Appendix E

CONSULTANTS AND STAFF

The consultants' contribution to this report consists of examinations into particular designated areas of concern; the responsibility for the final recommendations rests with the officers of the Academy.

Consultants:

Dr. Chester M. Alter, Executive Director, Western Region, Academy for Educational Development; Chancellor Emeritus, University of Denver.

Dr. Robert H. Atwell, Vice Chancellor for Administration, The University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Dr. William J. Baumol, Professor, Department of Economics, Princeton University.

Dr. Louis Bender, Acting Assistant Commissioner, Office of Higher Education, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Dr. William G. Bowen, Provost, Princeton University.

Dr. Harvie Branscomb, Education Consultant, Academy for Educational Development; Chancellor Emeritus, Vanderbilt University.

Dr. James Douglas Brown, Jr., Director of Executive Programs, Graduate School of Business, Columbia University; formerly Dean, School of Business Administration, Adelphi University.

Dr. Paul G. Bulger, Professor of Higher Education, State University of New York at Albany; formerly Associate Commissioner for Higher and Professional Education, New York State; President, SUNY College at Buffalo.

Dr. Allan M. Cartter, Chancellor, New York University; formerly Vice President, American Council on Education.

Dr. Douglass Cater, Senior Advisor, Academy for Educational Development; formerly Special Assistant to the President of the United States.

Dr. Lawrence E. Dennis, Chancellor, Board of Trustees of State Colleges of Rhode Island; formerly Regional Representative, Ford Foundation; Director of Commission on Academic Affairs, American Council on Education.

Dr. Joseph W. Fordyce, President, Santa Fe Junior College.

Dr. Lyman A. Glenny, Associate Director, The Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley; formerly Associate Director, Board of Higher Education, State of Illinois.

Dr. Robert H. Haveman, Research Associate, Resources for the Future; formerly Senior Economist, Joint Economic Committee, United States Congress.

Dr. Albert E. Holland, Vice President, Wellesley College; formerly President, Hobart and William Smith Colleges; Vice President, Trinity College.

Dr. Eugene H. Kleinpell, President Emeritus, Wisconsin State University, River Falls.

Dr. Leland L. Medsker, Director, The Center for Research and Development in Higher Education; Professor of Education, University of California, Berkeley.

Dr. Ernest G. Palola, The Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley.

Dr. James G. Paltridge, The Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley.

Dr. Alice M. Rivlin, Economic Studies Program, The Brookings Institution; formerly Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Dr. Raymond Schultz, Professor of Higher Education, Florida State University.

Mr. Roger D. Semerad, Director of Development, General Computing Corporation; formerly Director, Office of Federal Programs, American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

Mr. George M. Walton, formerly Executive Secretary, Pennsylvania Association of Colleges and Universities.

Dr. James Wattenbarger, Director, Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Florida; formerly Director of Junior Colleges, State of Florida.

Officers and Staff of the Academy Contributing to this Study:

Dr. Alvin C. Eurich, President.

Mr. Sidney G. Tickton, Executive Vice President.

Mr. Rexford G. Moon, Jr., Vice President and Director of Studies (Project Director).

Mr. Barry W. Schwenkmeyer, Assistant to the President (Assistant Project Director).

Mrs. Jacqueline Grennan Wexler, Vice President and Director, International University Studies.

Mrs. Judith Murphy, Executive Program Director and Executive Editor.

Dr. Jerome E. Lord, Research Associate.

Mrs. Louise Abrahams, Research Associate (Assistant Project Director).

Mr. John W. Malone, Writer.